BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD POLICY, RESEARCH & TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE:

N THE MATTER OF THE:

POLICY, RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL)

ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE MEETING)

DATE AND TIME: TUESDAY,

DECEMBER 2, 1997

9:39 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING

ROOM

8800 CAL

CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: MARK

BRICKMAN, CSR, RPR

CERTIFICATE

NO. 5527

BRS FILE NO.: 43390

MEMBERS PRESENT

MR. STEVEN R. JONES, CHAIRMAN

MR. DANIEL G. PENNINGTON, MEMBER

MR. PAUL RELIS, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

MR. RALPH CHANDLER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MR.

KEITH SMITH, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER MS. JEANNINE

BAKULICH, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

I N D E X

	PAGE	NO.
CALL TO ORDER		4
EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS ITEM 1: CONSIDERATION OF THE ANNUAL RULEMAKING CALENDAR. 5		5
ITEM 2: CONSIDERATION OF THE 17 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY RUBBERIZE CONCRETE TECHNOLOGY CENTER (RACTC) AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR FY 97/98.	ED ASP	HALT
ITEM 3: STATUS REPORT ON THE 61 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION DEREGULATION		
(AB 1890) OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY.		
OPEN DISCUSSION		
ADJOURNMENT 69		

1	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA - TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1997
2	9:39 A.M.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN JONES: GOOD MORNING. WELCOME
5	TO THE DECEMBER 2ND MEETING OF POLICY, RESEARCH
6	AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE.
7	JEANNINE, WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL?
8	THE SECRETARY: MEMBER RELIS?
9	MEMBER RELIS: HERE.
10	THE SECRETARY: MEMBER PENNINGTON?
11	MEMBER PENNINGTON: HERE.
12	CHAIRMAN JONES: HERE.
13	IF ANYBODY WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ABOUT
14	ANY ITEMS, I HAVE TWO SPEAKER SLIPS ALREADY. THE
15	SPEAKER SLIPS ARE IN THE BACK, SO YOU CAN GRAB
16	THEM, FILL IT OUT AND BRING IT UP HERE AND WE WILL
17	LET YOU SPEAK.
18	DOES ANYBODY HAVE ANY EX-PARTES?
19	MR. RELIS?
20	MEMBER RELIS: NO. MINE ARE ALL IN.
21	CHAIRMAN JONES: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON?
22	MEMBER PENNINGTON: NO, SIR, I DO NOT.
23	CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. I HAVE A COUPLE.
24 25	I SPOKE BRIEFLY WITH JACK MICHAELS AND LYNN NICHOLSON, AND WE TALKED FOR ABOUT A SECOND ON THE

1	L.A. RAC CENTER. AND THEN JACK AND I TALKED ABOUT
2	OUR FAVORITE SUBJECT, GRASSCYCLING IN SOUTHERN
3	CALIFORNIA, AND I SAID HELLO TO EVAN AND ALMA AND
4	MR. LEARY.
5	ALL RIGHT. OUR FIRST ITEM WE'RE
6	NOT TAKING ANY OF THESE OUT OF ORDER, THE QUESTION
7	WAS ASKED, AND WE'RE GOING TO JUST STICK WITH THE
8	AGENDA. THE FIRST ITEM IS THE CONSIDERATION OF
9	THE ANNUAL RULEMAKING CALENDAR.
10	MS. ZWARTS: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN JONES
11	AND BOARD MEMBERS. PATTY ZWARTS WITH THE
12	ADMINISTRATION OFFICE.
13	WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU, WHICH HAS
14	NEVER GONE BEFORE THE BOARD PREVIOUSLY, IS THE
15	ANNUAL RULEMAKING CALENDAR, PROPOSED REGULATIONS
16	THAT THE BOARD WILL BE CONSIDERING FOR THE NEXT
17	YEAR.
18	THERE ARE 21 REGULATORY PACKAGES ON
19	YOUR LIST. THESE ARE REGS REGULATIONS THAT
ARE	
20	EITHER IN PROGRESS OR WILL START NEXT YEAR. THIS
21	COMES BEFORE YOU AS A RESULT OF THE GOVERNOR'S
22	EXECUTIVE ORDER. IT REQUIRES ALL CITIES TO
SUBMIT	
23	DOCUMENTS TO THE RULEMAKING CALENDAR. IT MAKES

IT

VERY CLEAR THAT CITIES CANNOT ADOPT REGULATIONS
UNLESS THEY ARE LISTED ON THE REGULATORY

1 RULEMAKING CALENDAR. 2 ALSO ON YOUR PACKET IS A REGULATORY 3 OVERVIEW, WHICH IS A MORE DETAILED SUMMARY OF EACH 4 OF THE REG PACKAGES FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION. 5 IN ADOPTING THIS ITEM, I SHOULD LET YOU KNOW IT DOESN'T PRECLUDE THE BOARD FROM 6 7 REMOVING THEM OFF THE -- OFF THE AGENDA AT A LATER DATE, BUT IT DOES LIMIT THE BOARD'S ABILITY TO 8 PUT 9 NEW REGULATORY PACKAGES ON THE LIST BEFORE 10 PROCEEDING NEXT YEAR. AS I SAID, ALL STATE AGENCIES WILL 11 BE GOING THROUGH THIS PROCESS. THERE'S A LOT OF 12 13 ADDITIONAL POLICY GUIDANCE THAT WE NEED FOR THE ADMINISTRATION IN HOW TO INTERPRET THE EXECUTIVE 14 15 ORDER. WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED THAT, SO TO THE BEST 16 OF OUR ABILITY AND WORKING WITH CAL-EPA, WE HAVE PREPARED THIS ITEM BASED ON THEIR DIRECTION. 17 HAD HOPED TO HAVE ADMINISTRATION DIRECTION BEFORE 18 THIS TIME, BUT EXPECT IT SOMETIME NEXT YEAR MORE 19 20 LIKELY. 21 ALSO AS PART OF THIS ITEM, I SHOULD POINT OUT WE ARE PROPOSING THAT STAFF COME BACK 22 AT

23 A LATER DATE AS WELL IN THE SPRING TO PRESENT

MORE

24 INFORMATION TO THIS COMMITTEE ABOUT REGULATIONS
25 AND HOW THEY IMPACT THE BOARD.

1	AS YOU RECALL, WE PRESENTED AN ITEM
2	BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE ABOUT TWO MONTHS AGO ABOUT
3	THE SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW REQUIREMENTS THAT ARE
4	NOW IN LAW AS WELL AS MORE IMPACT ON THE EXECUTIVE
5	ORDER ON ECONOMIC ANALYSIS SUNSET REVIEW.
6	AGAIN, AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, WE
7	HAVEN'T RECEIVED DIRECTION FROM ADMINISTRATION OR
8	OAL ON HOW TO PROCEED ON THAT, SO IN THE ABSENCE
9	OF THAT, WE THOUGHT IT'S BEST TO POSTPONE THAT
10	LARGER CHUNK OF THE ITEM UNTIL THE SPRING
11	WHEN WE MIGHT HAVE RECEIVED THAT DIRECTION, AS
12	WELL AS IT'S APPROPRIATE BECAUSE IT WOULD COINCIDE
13	WITH OUR STRATEGIC PLAN AND FOUR PRIORITIES THAT
14	THE BOARD ADOPTED AND TO SEE HOW THOSE PRIORITIES
15	ALSO FIT INTO THE TWO RULEMAKING PACKAGES.
16	THAT'S BASICALLY THE ITEM THAT'S
17	BEFORE YOU TODAY, AND I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
18	QUESTIONS.
19	CHAIRMAN JONES: ANY QUESTIONS?
20	MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, YES.
21	CAN WE DO LIKE THE LEGISLATURE TO SAY AND HAVE A
22	SPOT DOES, LIKE IF SOMETHING COMES UP DURING THE
23	YEAR THAT YOU FEEL WE NEED TO INITIATE RULEMAKING,
24 25	ARE WE STUCK UNTIL NEXT YEAR? MS. ZWARTS: I BELIEVE THERE'S STILL

Ţ	FLEXIBILITY WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE ORDER TO GIVE THE
2	BOARD WHAT IT NEEDS TO GET REGS DONE.
3	IF, FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE AN
4	EMERGENCY REG OR AN EMERGENCY SHOULD COME TO PASS,
5	THERE ARE PROVISIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE ORDER THAT
6	ALLOWS US TO GO TO THE SECRETARY OF CAL-EPA AND
7	GET APPROVAL FOR DOING AN EMERGENCY REG, AND I
8	DON'T ANTICIPATE THAT WOULD BE A PROBLEM.
9	ALSO THE RULEMAKING CALENDAR SPEAKS
10	TO FORMAL BEGINNING OF A RULEMAKING PACKAGE. AS
11	YOU KNOW, THE BOARD DOES A LOT OF INFORMAL WORK ON
12	ITS REG PACKAGE A LOT AHEAD OF TIME BEFORE WE
13	START THE FORMAL REVIEW, SO I IMAGINE EVEN IF
14	HYPOTHETICALLY IN THE SPRING WE FELT THAT WE
15	NEEDED A NEW REG PACKAGE, WE PROBABLY WOULD MOST
16	LIKELY PROCEED WITH THE INFORMAL PROCESS FIRST,
17	AND THEN WOULD HAVE TO START THE FORMAL PROCESS
18	THE FOLLOWING YEAR.
19	MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY.
20	CHAIRMAN JONES: I HAVE A COUPLE OF JUST
21	REAL BRIEF COMMENTS, AND ONE OF THEM IS ON THE
22	BIOSOLIDS REGULATIONS.
23	I UNDERSTAND THAT THE INFORMAL
24 25	PROCESS HAS STARTED. THE FORMAL NOTICE IS NOVEMBER OF 1998, AND I THINK IN LIGHT OF THE

```
RSU -- AND FOR THOSE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO DON'T
 1
 2
       KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON THERE, THE REGULATORY
 3
        STRUCTURE UPDATE WITH DTSC THAT THEY'RE PROPOSING,
 4
        A LOT OF THE ISSUES THAT THEY'RE DEALING WITH ARE
 5
       MANAGEMENT ISSUES THAT DEAL WITH ASH, BIOSOLIDS,
       AND THE ASH REGULATIONS IN PLACE, BUT THEY'RE
 6
       GOING TO DEAL WITH BIOSOLIDS, THEY'RE GOING TO
 7
       DEAL WITH SOILS. AND I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE
 8
       FLEXIBILITY IS ON THIS PACKAGE IN PARTICULAR
 9
       BECAUSE I THINK WE HAVE TO BE ABLE TO REACT
10
        QUICKLY TO COME UP WITH WHAT COULD BE MANAGEMENT
11
        STANDARDS ON WHAT IS NOW A VERY VAGUE UNDER-
12
13
        STANDING WITH -- WITH THE RSU PROCESS.
                      EVERYTHING IS IN A STATE OF FLUX,
14
15
       AND WHENEVER YOU ASK A QUESTION, YOU DON'T REALLY
       GET AN ANSWER; YOU JUST GET A POSTPONEMENT AND A
16
       PROMISE THAT TRUST ME, YOU KNOW. WE WILL --
17
WE'LL
       LET YOU KNOW, AND -- BUT I THINK THAT IT'S
18
       CRITICAL THAT THERE'S FLEXIBILITY, ESPECIALLY ON
19
20
       THIS ITEM, AND I'M JUST WONDERING WHAT THAT
       FLEXIBILITY -- HOW THAT PROCESS WOULD WORK IF WE
21
       HAD TO ESCALATE OUR EFFORTS ON THIS.
22
23
                 MS. ZWARTS: YES. CHAIRMAN JONES, I
KNOW
```

THAT SOME ACTIVITIES AND WORKSHOPS HAVE BEGUN ON THE BIOSOLID, AND BOB HOLMES IS HERE TODAY AND

COULD ANSWER SOME QUESTIONS ON HOW THAT 1 2 FLEXIBILITY COULD WORK WITHIN THE EXISTING 3 SCHEDULE. 4 MR. HOLMES: YES. WE HAVE STARTED THE INFORMAL PROCESS. THE SCHEDULE THAT -- THAT THE 5 BOARD APPROVED EARLIER THIS YEAR HAD SOME SPECIFIC 6 7 TASKS INVOLVED IN THAT SCHEDULE. WE CAN SQUEEZE SOME EFFICIENCIES OUT 8 OF THAT, BUT PRETTY MUCH WE'RE -- WE'RE TIED TO 9 10 THAT SCHEDULE, BUT WE UNDERSTAND YOUR CONCERN AND WE CAN DO WHAT WE CAN TO SPEED THAT PROCESS UP. 11 CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. NOW, I KNOW WHAT 12 13 WE'RE DOING HERE IS BASICALLY APPROVING A VERY LARGE BLANKET TO MAKE SURE THAT NOTHING GETS 14 15 FILTERED THROUGH, SO I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH 16 THAT. I HAVE SOME ISSUES ON SOME OF THESE 17 THINGS AS FAR AS TIMING AND AS FAR AS THE SCOPE, 18 YOU KNOW, BUT I THINK THERE'S A TIME AND PLACE TO 19 20 DEAL WITH THOSE ISSUES. 21 MR. CHANDLER? 22 MR. CHANDLER: PATTY, I THINK IT WOULD BE23 USEFUL, JUST AS A CONSTANT REMINDER, TO POINT OUT 24 THE DISCUSSION WE HAD THE OTHER EVENING AS IT

25 RELATES TO THE C&D RATES AND THE BUDGET LANGUAGE

THAT WAS PASSED LAST YEAR RELATIVE TO SOME FISCAL 1 2 IMPACTS TO THIS ORGANIZATION, AND I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THE BOARD MEMBERS ARE AWARE OF THAT. 3 4 I THINK WE HAVE TO HAVE THE REGS TO THE FORMAL LEGISLATURE BY APRIL, AND I KNOW WE NOW 5 6 HAVE A REQUIREMENT THAT ANYTHING SUBMITTED TO THE 7 LEGISLATURE GO THROUGH SECRETARY ROONEY'S OFFICE. SOMETIMES THAT IS -- THAT ADDS ANOTHER 30 DAYS TO 8 9 THE PROCESS. 10 I WANT THE BOARD FULLY AWARE. WE'RE LOOKING AT HEARINGS IN MAY, ADOPTIONS IN JUNE. WE 11 HAVE A QUARTER-MILLION-DOLLAR DEAL ON OUR BUDGET 12 13 IF WE DON'T SUBMIT THOSE RATES. MAYBE THEY'RE PROPOSED OR DRAFTED, 14 15 ULTIMATELY THEY MAY END UP IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET, BUT WHY DON'T YOU ELABORATE ON THAT A 16 17 LITTLE BIT? MS. ZWARTS: YES. THIS WAS ON THE BUDGET 18 FOR LAST YEAR. SUPPLEMENTAL LANGUAGE WAS ADDED TO 19 20 THE BUDGET THAT REDUCED THE BOARD'S EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY BY A QUARTER OF A MILLION DOLLARS, BUT 21 WOULD GIVE IT BACK TO THE BOARD IF THE BOARD DID 22 TWO THINGS BY APRIL 1ST; THAT IS, ONE, PROVIDE A 23 24 PROGRESS REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE ON HOW IT WAS 25 DOING ADOPTING CONSTRUCTION DEMOLITION PACKAGES;

T	AND, TWO, THAT THEY REQUESTED THAT WE GIVE THEM
2	PROPOSED REGULATIONS AT THAT TIME, AS WELL.
3	THAT IS A BIT INCONSISTENT WITH THE
4	SCHEDULE THAT THE BOARD ADOPTED, MEANING IT'S A
5	BIT SOONER. WE HAD HOPED TO DO, YOU KNOW, THE
6	REGS AT LEAST AT A LITTLE LATER DATE THAN THAT, SO
7	WE WILL BE A BIT CRUNCHED ON THAT, BUT THEY DON'T
8	DEFINE EXACTLY WHAT PROPOSED REGS COULD BE. I
9	THINK THAT WOULD BE AN INFORMAL SET OF REGS FOR
10	THE FIRST DRAFT. I THINK THAT THEY LIKELY WOULD
11	BE HAPPY TO RECEIVE THAT, AS WELL.
12	WE'RE ACTUALLY HAVING A MEETING WITH
13	THE SECRETARY'S OFFICE AFTER THIS COMMITTEE TO
14	DISCUSS THAT.
15	AS RALPH INDICATED, AS WELL,
16	SECRETARY ROONEY HAS A NEW POLICY NOW. HE WANTS
17	TO SIGN OFF ON ALL THE REPORTS TO THE LEGISLATURE.
18	THAT WOULD INCLUDE THE PROGRESS REPORT REQUESTED
19	UNDER THE BUDGET ACT, AND THAT COULD AND WOULD ADD
20	SOME MORE TIME AND CRUNCH US EVEN FURTHER ON THAT
21	REGULATORY PACKAGE TO GET IT DONE SOONER.
22	I DO KNOW STAFF IS WORKING HARD ON
23	THIS, TRYING TO PUT TOGETHER WORKSHOPS ON C&D
24 25	WASTES ALREADY. MEMBER RELIS: CLARIFICATION THERE,

1 250,000 IS BEING RESERVED, WE'LL CALL IT, SUBJECT 2 TO RECEIVING THE REG PACKAGE, NOT APPROVING THE 3 REG PACKAGE, CORRECT? 4 MS. ZWARTS: CORRECT. RECEIVING IT, AND 5 AGAIN, THE MONEY DOESN'T GO ANYWHERE. THE EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IS REDUCED. YOU CAN'T SPEND 6 IT; BUT IF WE PROVIDED THE TWO DOCUMENTS, THE 7 8 REPORT AND THE PROPOSED REGS, ON TIME, ACCORDING TO THE BUDGET, THE MONEY WOULD BE RELEASED FOR US 9 TO SPEND. 10 MEMBER RELIS: SO EVEN THOUGH WE MAY 11 12 STILL BE WELL IN THE REGULATORY PROCESS, AS WE 13 KNOW, IT DOESN'T WRAP UP ALL THAT EASY, AND I WOULDN'T EXPECT THE C&D REGS WOULD TO BE A PIECE 14 15 OF CAKE. 16 MS. ZWARTS: IT'S A RATHER COMPLICATED SET OF REGULATIONS AND MUCH FURTHER TO GO ON 17 18 WORKING THOSE OUT WITH THE VARIOUS INTERESTED 19 PARTIES, BUT IT'S AN IMPORTANT ISSUE AND THEY SHARE A PARTICULAR INTEREST IN IT AND, THAT'S WHY 20 THEY REQUESTED THAT THE LEGISLATURE HAVE AN 21 22 ABILITY TO SEE SOME PROPOSED REGS AT AN EARLY 23 DATE. 24 CHAIRMAN JONES: WHAT'S THE LIKELIHOOD 25 THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO LIVE WITH THAT OR

1	LOSE THE QUARTER OF A MILLION?
2	MS. ZWARTS: WELL, I THINK STAFF, I'M
3	SURE, ARE TRYING THEIR DARNDEST. NO ONE WANTS TO
4	LOSE OUR AUTHORITY FOR A QUARTER OF A MILLION
5	DOLLARS, AND THE QUESTION IS HOW PROPOSED LOOKING
6	SHOULD THE PROPOSED REGS BE?
7	AND I GUESS WE'LL HAVE THAT
8	CONVERSATION THIS AFTERNOON, AND WE'LL LET THEM
9	KNOW ABOUT THAT, ABOUT OUR DILEMMA.
10	CHAIRMAN JONES: OKAY. ANY OTHER
11	QUESTIONS?
12	MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL
13	MOVE ADOPTION OF
14	CHAIRMAN JONES: WAIT A MINUTE. I'M
15	SORRY. I NEGLECTED TO CALL ONE OF THE SPEAKERS.
16	I APOLOGIZE.
17	MR I HAVE ONE SPEAKER SLIP, MR.
18	LEARY FROM BFI. SORRY ABOUT THAT.
19	MR. LEARY: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN
20	AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. MY NAME IS MARK
21	LEARY FROM BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES. IS
THIS	
22	WORKING?
23	I HAVE ONE COMMENT THAT KIND OF
24	PIGGYBACKS ON CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON'S IDEA, AND
THE	

25 THOUGHT IS THAT WE KNOW THAT THE U.S. EPA IS ABOUT

1	TO PROMULGATE THE FEDERAL REGULATIONS FOR THE
2	PLANNING ASSURANCES BY CORPORATE GUARANTEE, BY
3	CORPORATE FINANCIAL TEST.
4	WE'RE ANTICIPATING THOSE REGULATIONS
5	TO BE RELEASED BY U.S. EPA SOMETIME THIS WINTER.
6	IN FACT, THEY'VE BEEN PROMISED ANY DAY NOW BEFORE
7	THIS PERIOD OF TIME.
8	WE'RE WONDERING ABOUT THE
9	PROBABILITY OF A PLACEHOLDER HERE FOR THAT PACKAGE
10	TO COME TO FRUITION. OBVIOUSLY IT'S SPURRED GREAT
11	INTEREST TO MY COMPANY AND OTHER SOLID WASTE
12	COMPANIES. THE EXECUTIVE ORDER APPEARS TO ALLOW
13	SOMETHING TO BE AN EXCEPTION TO THE RULEMAKING
14	CALENDAR PURSUANT TO STATE LAW OR FEDERAL LAW.
15	DOES THAT ALSO INCLUDE FEDERAL
16	REGULATIONS WOULD BE MY COMMENT; AND IF THAT'S
17	OKAY, THEN THERE PROBABLY IS NOT A NEED FOR A
18	PLACEHOLDER, BUT IF NOT, I'D LIKE TO SEE IT.
I'D	
19	LIKE TO SEE IT ADDED, ALTHOUGH THERE IS
20	MS. ZWARTS: IF I COULD ASSIST WITH
THAT.	
21	FEDERAL LAW WOULD INCLUDE FEDERAL REGULATIONS;
SO	
22	IF FEDERAL REGS WERE RELEASED, WE COULD PREPARE

Α

23	RATE PACKAGE IF NEEDED AND BE WITHIN THE LIMITS
OF	
24	THE EXECUTIVE ORDER.
25	THERE'S ALSO NOTHING AS YOU

RECALL -- AS YOU CAN SEE, A LOT OF THESE REG 1 2 PACKAGES ARE JUST VERY SIMPLE DESCRIPTIONS. 3 THERE'S A SIMILAR RATE PACKAGE, WE COULDN'T PUT 4 THAT INTO THE EXISTING REGULATORY PACKAGE, AS 5 WELL. 6 MR. CHANDLER: SO THAT WILL GO TO AGENCY 7 NEXT? 8 MS. ZWARTS: THIS WILL GO TO AGENCY, OAL, 9 AND EVENTUALLY THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE. 10 MR. CHANDLER: THEN WHY DON'T WE INCLUDE IN OUR TRANSMITTAL OUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT IN 11 12 TRANSMITTING THIS, WE ALSO RECOGNIZE IT WOULD MEET 13 THE FEDERAL STATUTES AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND 14 WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO ACT ON THOSE AS THE BOARD DEEMS APPROPRIATE, SO WE'LL REINFORCE OUR 15 16 UNDERSTANDING OF HOW THAT WORKS. 17 MS. ZWARTS: YES. WE CERTAINLY COULD PUT18 THAT IN THE COVER LETTER, THAT THE AGENCY IS 19 TRANSMITTING THIS.

MR. LEARY: TERRIFIC. THANK YOU.

20

21	MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'M PREPARED TO
MAKE	
22	A MOTION.
23	CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT, MR. CHAIR.
24	MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL MOVE ADOPTION
OF 25	THE RULEMAKING CALENDAR TO 1998 REGULATORY

1	OVERVIEW AND RULEMAKING CALENDAR REG.
2	MEMBER RELIS: SECOND.
3	CHAIRMAN JONES: WE HAVE A MOTION AND
4	SECOND.
5	JEANNINE, WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL?
6	THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS?
7	MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
8	THE SECRETARY: MEMBER PENNINGTON?
9	MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE.
10	THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES?
11	CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE. YES.
12	ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
13	AGENDA ITEM NO. 2, CONSIDERATION OF
14	THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
15	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE TECHNOLOGY CENTER AND
16	ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR THE '97-'98.
17	MS. GILDART: GOOD MORNING. MARTHA
18	GILDART WITH THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET
19	DEVELOPMENT DIVISION. I'M GOING TO BE TALKING
20	ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED DOWN IN LOS ANGELES WITH
21	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT.
22	AS YOU REMEMBER LAST YEAR, I THINK
23	IT WAS IN DECEMBER, IN FACT, THE BOARD ALLOCATED
24 25	\$500,000 FROM THE '96-'97 FISCAL YEAR TIRE FUND FOR A CONTRACT WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY TO PROMOTE

1	THE USE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE BY THE
2	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.
3	THE REASON WE ARE HERE TODAY IS TO
4	LOOK AT THE PROGRESS MADE UNDER THAT CONTRACT AND
5	WHETHER OR NOT AN ADDITIONAL \$500,000 THAT'S BEEN
6	ALLOCATED FROM THE '97-'98 FISCAL YEAR TIRE FUND
7	SHOULD BE PUT TO A SIMILAR EFFORT.
8	I'M GOING TO GIVE A VERY BRIEF
9	BACKGROUND ON HOW THE CONTRACT WAS DEVELOPED AND
10	WHAT WAS INTENDED TO ACHIEVE AND THEN LYNN
11	NICHOLSON WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY WILL BE GIVING
12	YOU INFORMATION ON WHAT THEY HAVE DONE, AND THEN
13	AFTER HE'S MADE HIS PRESENTATION, HE AND THE STAFF
14	AND I WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE
15	MEMBERS.
16	THE CONTRACT WAS INTENDED TO PROMOTE
17	THE USE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE. WE WERE
18	HOPING TO SEE AN INCREASE IN USE. THE FEELING WAS
19	THAT A LOCAL GOVERNMENT ENTITY WORKING WITH OTHER
20	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WOULD HAVE BETTER SUCCESS IN
21	COMMUNICATING THE USEFULNESS OF THIS MATERIAL.
22	THE TECHNICAL MATERIAL WAS TO
23	PROVIDE SERVICES TO LOCAL AGENCIES ON THE
24 25	TECHNOLOGY. THEY WERE TO MAKE AVAILABLE THEIR LABORATORY EQUIPMENT AND PROCESSES. THEY

1	WERE TO ESTABLISH AN OUTREACH, TRAINING AND
2	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM TO TRY AND PROMOTE THE USE
3	THROUGHOUT THE STATE AND SET UP AN INTERNET WEB
4	SITE TO GET THE WORD OUT.
5	THE BOARD HAD ALSO RETAINED APPROVAL
6	RIGHT OF ACTUAL PROJECTS IF THEY ARE APPROACHED BY
7	LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND THERE'S, YOU KNOW, MORE THAN
8	ONE REQUEST FOR THEIR ASSISTANCE, AND THE BOARD
9	HAS A MECHANISM TO WORK WITH THE COUNTY ON THE
10	SELECTION OF WHICH ONES WOULD GO WHEN.
11	TO EVALUATE THE SUCCESS OF THE
12	PROGRAM, LOS ANGELES COUNTY HAS BEEN SUBMITTING
13	QUARTERLY STATUS REPORTS, AND THERE'S ALSO A
14	PROCESS UNDER DEVELOPMENT FOR JURISDICTIONS AS TO
15	THE SURVEY FORM, CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY FORM
16	THAT WOULD COME BACK TO THE BOARD AFTER THEY
17	RECEIVED ASSISTANCE FROM THE COUNTY.
18	THE TIMELINE ON THE CONTRACT WAS
19	SUCH THAT EVEN THOUGH IT WAS FISCAL YEAR '97-'98
20	DOLLARS, THE ACTUAL CONTRACT THAT WE DEVELOPED WAS
21	NOT SENT DOWN TO LOOK UNTIL APRIL, AND BY THE TIME
22	THE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS VOTED ON IT, IT
23	WAS MID-JUNE, CAME BACK HERE FOR EXECUTION BY
THE	
24 25	DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES ON JULY 9TH. SO THE COUNTY HAS BEEN WORKING ON

THIS CONTRACT SINCE JULY, AND I THINK IF LYNN 1 2 NICHOLSON IS READY, HE CAN GIVE YOU THE 3 DESCRIPTION OF WHAT THEY'VE DONE TO DATE. 4 LYNN. 5 CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT. MR. 6 NICHOLSON. 7 MR. NICHOLSON: HI. IF I MIGHT, I'VE GOT 8 BROCHURES AND WORKBOOKS THAT I NEED TO PASS OUT AS 9 WE'RE TALKING. 10 THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY. I'M 11 THE HEAD OF THE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE 12 TECHNOLOGY CENTER, WHICH IS A MOUTHFUL WHEN YOU'RE 13 TRYING TO ANSWER THE PHONE, BUT WE COULDN'T THINK 14 OF ANY SHORTER NAME. 15 MARTHA HAS BASICALLY GONE OVER THE 16 BASIS FOR THE CONTRACT WITH THE BOARD AND I THINK 17 IT'S A GOOD IDEA. SHE DIDN'T MENTION, I THINK, AS 18 YOU PROBABLY KNOW, I RETIRED FROM REGULAR COUNTY

19	SERVICE IN MARCH AND WAS BROUGHT ON AS A COUNTY
20	EMPLOYEE ON A RETIREE BASIS SPECIFICALLY TO DO
21	THIS PROGRAM, AND THAT'S MY ONLY JOB AND I GOT
THE	
22	SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT WHEN I NEED IT AND
IT'S	
23	WORKING OUT, I THINK, VERY WELL.
24	IF YOU LOOK IN THE PACKAGE THAT
25	CAREN IS PACKING OUT OR PASSING OUT, I'VE
INCLUDE	ZD .

1	WHAT I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT IN THE GREEN PAGES.
2	THE WHITE PAGES ARE PRESENTATION WORKBOOKS THAT
3	I'VE PUT TOGETHER IN TALKING WITH THE CITIES AND
4	THE COUNTIES ABOUT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE,
5	SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT HAS COME UP AT OUR
6	WORKSHOPS AND AT OUR BOOTH DISPLAYS.
7	THE PICTURE THAT SHE'S PASSED OUT IS
8	A PICTURE OF OUR BOOTH DISPLAYS AT THE COUNTY
9	CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES'
10	CONVENTION A COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO IN BURLINGAME.
11	WE ALSO DID THE SAME DISPLAY AT ITS
12	SYMPOSIUM IN ANAHEIM AND THE LEAGUE OF CITIES
13	CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO IN OCTOBER.
14	WE RECEIVED AN AWFUL LOT OF INTEREST
15	FROM THE PEOPLE THAT VISITED THE BOOTH, THE CITY
16	COUNCILMEMBERS, COUNTY SUPERVISORS, ENGINEERS,
17	PLANNERS, EVEN ATTORNEYS IN OUR PROCESS OF
18	PROMOTING THE USE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT.
19	WE'RE GOING TO DO THIS BY, AS
MARTHA	
20	SAID, PROVIDING REGIONAL WORKSHOPS AT THE
21	LOCATION. WE DID ONE IN ALAMEDA COUNTY.
GENERAL	
22	SERVICES AUTHORITY DID ONE FOR THE WASTE
23	MANAGEMENT BOARD, ALAMEDA COUNTY, AND I'VE DONE

- ONE ON THE PENINSULA CITIES, PALOS VERDES
- 25 PENINSULA CITIES.

Τ	WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF SETTING UP
2	MINI WORKSHOPS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND
3	BAKERSFIELD/FRESNO AREA AND, WE'RE CONSIDERING
4	REGIONAL WORKSHOPS IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, IN
5	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, AND CENTRAL CALIFORNIA.
6	THE REGIONAL WORKSHOPS WOULD BE A
7	MUCH MORE FORMAL THING. THE MINI WORKSHOPS WILL
8	BE AN HOUR, HOUR AND A HALF PRESENTATION THAT
9	BASICALLY GIVES ALL OF THE INFORMATION AND
10	HOPEFULLY WILL GET EVERYBODY EXCITED ABOUT USING
11	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT.
12	WE WILL GIVE THEM TECHNICAL
13	CONSULTATIONS. WE'LL PROVIDE COPIES OF CALTRANS
14	SPECS, L.A. COUNTY GREEN BOOK SPECS, WHATEVER
15	PROBLEMS THEY HAVE, WHATEVER THE QUESTIONS
16	THEY HAVE IN THE USE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT WE'LL
17	PROVIDE ASSISTANCE ON THAT.
18	WE ENCOURAGE THE CITIES TO THINK
19	ABOUT USING RUBBERIZED ASPHALT WHENEVER THEY HAVE
20	A RESURFACING PROJECT. WE'RE NOT ENCOURAGING THE
21	CITIES TO THINK ABOUT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT ON FULL
22	RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS BECAUSE IT'S REALLY NOT
23	COST-EFFECTIVE IN THAT WAY. IT'S BETTER ON THE
24 25 ON	RESURFACING. IF YOU LOOK IN THE WORKBOOK LATER

1	ON PAGE 16 THROUGH 20, I'VE SHOWN EXAMPLES ON HOW
2	MUCH MONEY CAN BE SAVED USING RUBBERIZED ASPHALT,
3	AND IT CAN AMOUNT UP TO \$30,000 PER 12-FOOT LANE
4	MILE OF RESURFACING. SO THERE'S REALLY A COST
5	INCENTIVE FOR THE CITIES TO START USING RUBBERIZED
6	ASPHALT EVEN THOUGH IT COSTS MORE PER TON THAN
7	CONVENTIONAL ASPHALT.
8	THE HOTLINE THAT WE HAVE, THE
9	TOLL-FREE HOTLINE, WE GET ABOUT FOUR CALLS A DAY
10	MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY. I MONITOR IT FROM 6
11	O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING TILL 6 O'CLOCK IN THE
12	EVENING. I'M NOT AT THE DESK, BUT IT PAGES
13	ME WHEN IT RINGS AND I CALL THEM BACK, AND IT'S
14	BEEN WORKING OUT VERY GOOD.
15	THE RESPONSE THAT THE IMPRESSION
16	I GET FROM PEOPLE THAT I TALK WITH, THEY'RE
17	SURPRISED WHEN I GET BACK TO THEM SO QUICKLY WITH
18	THEIR QUESTIONS, AND IT'S WORKING OUT REAL GOOD.
19	WE WILL PROVIDE ON-SITE ASSISTANCE.
20	MY THOUGHT IS THAT WHEN THE CITY OR COUNTY THAT
21	HAS THE NEW PROJECT AND THEY'RE NOT QUITE SURE
22	WHAT IS NECESSARY ON INSPECTION OR THE PLANT OR
23	THE MANUFACTURE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE, I
24 25	WILL PROVIDE MYSELF OR ONE OF MY INSPECTORS TO GO TO THAT CITY AND SPEND THE DAY WITH THEM AND

1	MAKE SURE THAT THE JOB IS DONE RIGHT.
2	IN TALKING WITH AGENCIES THAT HAVE
3	USED RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE, THE GREATER
4	PERCENTAGE OF THEM HAVE HAD GOOD SUCCESS, BUT IT'S
5	ALWAYS THE ONE OR TWO FAILURES THAT EVERYBODY
6	TALKS ABOUT.
7	CALTRANS KEEPS TALKING ABOUT THE
8	THREE OR FOUR FAILURES THEY'VE HAD, AND THESE
9	FAILURES WERE CAUSED AND CALTRANS AGREES WITH
10	THIS NOT BY THE PRODUCT, BUT BY EITHER
11	CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE MANUFACTURE OR CIRCUMSTANCES
12	IN THE LAYDOWN OF THE PRODUCT.
13	WE'VE HAD TWO EXAMPLES IN LOS
14	ANGELES COUNTY WHERE THE FAILURE WAS CAUSED NOT BY
15	THE PRODUCT, BUT THE WAY IT WAS MANUFACTURED AND
16	PLACED, AND THIS IS WHAT WE WANT TO DO WITH THE
17	ON-SITE ASSISTANCE.
18	WE'RE NOT GOING TO DO THEIR TOTAL
19	INSPECTION FOR THEM AS PART OF THIS PROGRAM. I
20	DON'T THINK THAT'S WHAT WE HAD IN MIND, BUT WE'LL
21	GET THEM ON THE RIGHT TRACK ON THE FIRST DAY SO
22	THAT THEY CAN FINISH THE JOB AND DO IT RIGHT.
23	I DON'T WANT TO TAKE TOO MUCH OF
24 25	YOUR TIME, BUT ON PAGE 2 OF THE GREEN SHEETS, WE'LL JUST KIND OF GO OVER THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO

1	DATE, AND I HAVE TO APOLOGIZE TO MARTHA ON THE
2	STATUS REPORTS, THE MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS. I'VE
3	DONE IT KIND OF BRIEF, I'VE COVERED EVERYTHING,
4	BUT IT'S NOT.
5	WE PERSONALLY DISTRIBUTED OVER 800
6	BROCHURES AND A HUNDRED OF THESE WORKBOOKS TO
7	COUNTY SUPERVISORS, CITY COUNCILMEMBERS, CITY
8	MANAGERS, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTORS, AND CITY
9	ENGINEERS AT CONFERENCES.
10	THIS IS THE I.T.S. CONFERENCE, THE
11	LEAGUE OF CITIES, LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES
12	CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO AND THE RECENT CSET
13	CONFERENCE, AND YOU'LL NOTICE THAT THE NUMBER OF
14	ATTENDEES AT THESE CONFERENCES IS TREMENDOUS.
OF	
15	COURSE, WE DIDN'T TALK TO EVERYBODY, BUT WE
TALKED	
16	TO A GREAT NUMBER OF THEM.
17	WE'VE MAILED BROCHURES TO EACH
CITY	
18	ENGINEER AND OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS IN THE STATE
19	OF CALIFORNIA. THEY WENT OUT ABOUT A MONTH AGO.
20	THE RESPONSE IS COMING IN. I'VE GOTTEN ABOUT
21	FORTY RESPONSES BACK TO DATE, AND I EXPECT QUITE
A	

22

BIT MORE.

23 A LOT OF TIMES PEOPLE GET

BROCHURES

24 AND THEY GET THE LITTLE COVER LETTER, AND IF 25 THEY'RE LIKE ME, THEY'RE GOING TO LOOK AT THEM,

1	MAYBE PUT THEM ASIDE UNTIL SOMETHING COMES UP.
2	BUT THEY HAVE A BUSINESS REPLY CARD ON THE
3	BROCHURE WHICH YOU CAN SEE. ALL THEY HAVE TO DO
4	IS FILL IT OUT, I'LL CALL THEM, SET UP A MEETING
5	OR JUST WHATEVER I CAN DO FOR THEM.
6	WE'VE CONDUCTED THREE WORKSHOPS THAT
7	I'VE MENTIONED. THE ALAMEDA COUNTY GENERAL
8	SERVICES AUTHORITY HAD 26 PEOPLE, ENGINEERS AND
9	MAINTENANCE PEOPLE.
10	ONE OF THOSE, GEORGE BOLTON, IS VERY
11	EXCITED ABOUT GETTING THE COUNTY TO ADMINISTER
12	PROJECTS WITHIN CITIES SIMILAR TO THE WAY THE
13	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DOES WHERE WE'LL TAKE A
14	PROJECT AND WE'LL ADMINISTER A PROJECT THROUGH
15	SEVERAL JURISDICTIONS. THE ADVANTAGE OF DOING
16	THIS WITH RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE IS THAT YOU
17	CAN GET MORE TONNAGE.
18	MOST OF THESE CITIES I TALK WITH,
19	THE SMALL CITIES, THEY RESURFACE 3 TO 4,000 TONS A
20	YEAR ON SEVERAL PROJECTS.
21	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE IS NOT
22	COST-EFFECTIVE AT THIS RATE IF YOU NEED 10 TO
23	12,000 TONS ON A PROJECT OR PROJECTS BACK TO BACK
24 25	IN ORDER FOR COMPANIES TO EFFECTIVELY BID RUBBERIZED ASPHALT AS AN ALTERNATIVE.

1	THEY GAVE PRESENTATIONS TO 70 COUNTY
2	ENGINEERS AT THE SEASIDE CONFERENCE IN BURLINGAME
3	A COUPLE WEEKS AGO; WENT OVER VERY GOOD.
4	THE COUNTY ENGINEER PEOPLE, I THINK,
5	WERE MORE INTERESTED AS A WHOLE THAN THE CITY
6	PEOPLE. I'M NOT SURE OF THE REASON FOR THAT
7	EXCEPT THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE LARGER PROJECTS IN
8	WHICH THE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE WOULD BE
9	MORE SUITABLE, ALTHOUGH SOME OF THE SUPERVISORS
10	SAID THAT THEY'RE LOSING 40 MILES A YEAR OF
11	ASPHALT PAVEMENT TO DIRT BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE
12	ENOUGH MONEY, AND THIS IS A PROBLEM I THINK THAT
13	IS STATEWIDE IN SOME OF THE OUTLYING COUNTIES.
14	THROUGH THE ASSISTANCE REPORTS, AS I
15	MENTIONED, OVER 50, THERE WAS A HOTLINE.
16	ACTUALLY, IT'S MORE THAN THAT, BUT A LOT OF THEM
17	WERE RETURN CALLS WITH OTHER STAFF, SO I'VE KIND
18	OF COMBINED IT, AND WE PUBLISHED ARTICLES IN THE
19	PUBLIC WORKS JOURNAL, THE WASHINGTON TIRE
20	REPORT, CALIFORNIA TIRE REPORT, THE RTA
21	NEWSLETTER, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER GROUP,
22	AND THE CDAC NEWSLETTER AND BIOCYCLE MAGAZINE, AND
23	I'VE BEEN GETTING CALLS FROM THROUGHOUT THE
24 25	COUNTRY AS A RESULT OF THESE. I GIVE THEM THE INFORMATION. MY

1 GOAL IS TO WORK WITHIN CALIFORNIA, BUT I HAVE 2 PROVIDED BROCHURES AND THE WORKBOOK TO PEOPLE FROM 3 OUT OF STATE. 4 GOING ON TO PAGE 3 QUICKLY, A 5 SUMMARY OF THE INFORMATION WE'VE RECEIVED FROM OUR CONTACTS. ALMOST EVERYBODY'S INTERESTED IN USING 6 7 RUBBERIZED ASPHALT. 8 THERE ARE CONCERNS ABOUT THE LIMITED SOURCES OF CRUMB-RUBBER. AT THE CURRENT TIME, 9 THERE'S ONLY ONE MANUFACTURER OF CRUMB-RUBBER, AND 10 THAT'S IN SAN BERNARDINO. HE IS NOT BEYOND HIS 11 CAPACITY, SO THAT ISN'T A REAL PROBLEM, BUT I'VE 12 13 HAD CONTACT FROM A GUY NAMED LARRY BARTON, I THINK HIS NAME IS, WHO IS CONSIDERING ESTABLISHING A 14 15 CRUMB-RUBBER MANUFACTURING PLANT IN ALAMEDA 16 COUNTY. IF THAT HAPPENS, THEN CRUMB-RUBBER 17 WILL BE AVAILABLE, MORE AVAILABLE IN CENTRAL AND 18 19 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, WHICH WILL HELP THE COSTS. SMALL JOBS ARE NOT EFFECTIVE USE OF CRUMB-RUBBER. 20 I THINK WE HAVE TO REALIZE THIS, AND IN TALKING 21 22 WITH THE PUBLIC OFFICIALS, IF THEY HAVE A SMALL 23 JOB AND THEY'RE NOT GOING TO DO A LOT OF ENGINEERING TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT 24 RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IS COST-EFFECTIVE AND THEY'RE JUST 25

GOING

1	TO RECONSTRUCT OR THEY'RE JUST GOING TO PUT AN
2	INCH OF ASPHALT DOWN, IT'S NOT COST-EFFECTIVE.
3	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IS STRONGER, MORE
4	DURABLE THAN CONVENTIONAL ASPHALT, BUT IT HAS TO
5	BE USED IN THE RIGHT SPOTS. IF WE USE IT IN THE
6	WRONG SPOTS, IT'S JUST GOING TO COST THEM MONEY
7	BECAUSE THEY'RE REALLY NOT GOING TO TAKE THE
8	BENEFITS OF IT.
9	MOST CITIES USE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT
10	BECAUSE IT LOOKS BETTER, RIDES BETTER, IS
QUIETER	
11	AND BECAUSE THERE IS A PROPONENT OF RUBBERIZED
12	ASPHALT WITHIN THE CITY THAT'S PUSHING IT.
13	THE CITY OF PALOS VERDES ESTATES
HAS	
14	A PROPONENT ON THE CITY COUNCIL AND HE WANTS
15	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT ON EVERY STREET IN THE CITY,
16	AND THE REASON HE LIKES IT IS BECAUSE IT STAYS
17	NEW, LOOKING NEW LONGER AND IT'S QUIETER, HE
SAYS,	
18	AND I'VE HEARD THAT FROM SEVERAL PEOPLE, THAT IT
19	IS QUIETER. I BELIEVE IT MYSELF, BUT I DON'T
20	THINK THERE'S ANY REAL REPORTS ON IT, ALTHOUGH
RTA	
21	CLAIMS TO HAVE ONE.
22	RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IS PERCEIVED BY

A	
23	FEW PEOPLE TO BE HAZARDOUS OR NON-RECYCLABLE.
24	THEY'RE CONCERNED ABOUT FIRES. EVERYBODY'S
HEARD 25 THAT	ABOUT THE ROAD FILL IN OREGON AND WASHINGTON

1	STARTED ON FIRE. IT'S NOT GOING TO HAPPEN HERE.
2	RUBBERIZED RUBBER BURNS AT 650
3	DEGREES. ASPHALT BURNS AT 400 AND SOME DEGREES,
4	SO IF THERE'S GOING TO BE A FIRE, IT'S GOING TO BE
5	ASPHALT, RIGHT? AND THERE'S ONLY 30 POUNDS OF
6	RUBBER PER TON OF ASPHALT, SO WE'RE NOT TALKING
7	ABOUT BIG CHUNKS IN THE ROAD FILL.
8	IT CAN BE MILLED AND RECYCLED. WE
9	HAVE A COMPANY IN LOS ANGELES THAT'S RECYCLING,
10	THAT'S WORKING WITH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES ON
11	RECYCLING ASPHALT PAVEMENT BY JUST BRINGING IT TO
12	THE PLANT, SENDING IT THROUGH THE CRUSHERS,
ADDING	
13	A LITTLE BIT OF ASPHALT, IF NECESSARY, AND THEY
14	CAN ADD A LITTLE BIT OF RUBBER IF THEY WANT, SO
IT	
15	IS RECYCLABLE.
16	SOME OF THE ONE OF THE THINGS
17	THAT KIND OF BOTHERED ME IS THAT BEING FROM THE
18	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND HAVING A LOT OF
19	FACILITIES TO DO ENGINEERING DESIGN WHEN IT COMES
20	TO ROADWAYS, STRUCTURAL SECTIONS, I GUESS I GOT
TO	
21	KIND OF THINK THAT EVERYBODY DOES THIS.
22	I MEAN, A ROADWAY STRUCTURAL

SECTION

23	ANALYSIS COSTS ABOUT \$5,000 PER MILE. THIS IS
24	MAXIMUM, AND YET MOST CITIES DON'T DO IT. THEY
GO 25	OUT AND LOOK AT A JOB THAT LOOKS LIKE IT'S

1 ALLIGATOR. "LET'S PUT THREE INCHES OF ASPHALT ON 2 IT." 3 TO ME, THAT'S A WASTE OF MONEY. 4 THEY'RE NOT DOING THE \$5,000 WORTH OF PRELIMINARY 5 WORK TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEY NEED THREE INCHES OR TWO INCHES OR FULL RECONSTRUCTION, BUT THERE'S 6 7 A -- I GUESS THEY HAVE A HANGUP WITH THE UP-FRONT 8 MONEY AND THEY PUT TWO INCHES DOWN, IT LASTS QUITE A WHILE, BUT MAYBE THEY ONLY NEEDED AN INCH AND A 9 HALF. THEY COULD HAVE DONE SOME MORE STREETS. 10 THEY DON'T -- A LOT OF THE CITIES 11 DON'T PROVIDE QUALITY ASSURANCE. THEY DON'T 12 13 PROVIDE JOB INSPECTION. I DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S 14 THE PURPOSE OF THIS ORGANIZATION, TO PROVIDE THAT 15 FOR THEM, BUT I'M JUST TRYING TO STRESS WITH THE 16 CITIES AS I TALK TO THEM AND THE COUNCIL MEMBERS AND THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS THAT IF YOU WANT A GOOD 17 18 JOB, YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE TO INSPECT IT, AND I THINK I'VE GOT THE WORD ACROSS. WHETHER OR NOT 19 IT'S GOING TO DO ANY GOOD, I DON'T KNOW. 20 FUTURE PROGRAM GOALS. THROUGH 21 THE -- WE'VE GOT ANOTHER YEAR TO GO ON THIS 22 23 CURRENT CONTRACT THROUGH NOVEMBER OF '98. WE WILL 24 CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE OUTREACH SERVICES THAT WE

HAVE, THE CONFERENCES, THE ONE-ON-ONE CONTACTS.

25

AS SOON AS CITIES GET SOME PROJECTS TOGETHER,

1

2 WE'LL PROVIDE THE ON-SITE ASSISTANCE, HELP THEM 3 WITH THEIR SPECIFICATIONS. 4 WE'RE GOING TO ENCOURAGE MORE 5 COMPANIES TO PROVIDE THE MATERIAL. IF CRUMB-RUBBER IS THE BASIC MATERIAL, THE BLENDING 6 EQUIPMENT HAS TO BE BROUGHT INTO THE SITE, INTO 7 8 THE AREA, AND THIS CAN BE DONE BY GETTING THE 9 COMPANIES EXCITED ABOUT BRINGING THE EQUIPMENT IN AND GETTING THE CITIES AND THE COUNTIES EXCITED 10 ABOUT USING THE PRODUCT. ONCE THE PRODUCT STARTS 11 TO BE USED, THE COMPANIES WILL BE IN THERE BECAUSE 12 13 THAT'S THEIR LIVELIHOOD. WE'RE GOING TO ENCOURAGE THE CITIES 14 15 AND THE COUNTIES TO COMBINE THEIR PROJECTS SO THAT 16 INSTEAD OF ALAMEDA COUNTY, FOR EXAMPLE, THEY WANT TO -- IF THEY'RE WORKING ON A PROPOSAL TO GET WITH 17 18 THE 14 CITIES IN THEIR COUNTY AND COME UP WITH 19 SHARED PROJECTS WHICH THE CITY WILL PAY THEIR SHARE AND ALAMEDA COUNTY WILL DO THE 20 ADMINISTRATION OF IT. THAT WAY YOU CAN GET 21 22 PROJECTS -- INSTEAD OF 2,000 TONS, YOU CAN GET 23 12,000 TONS ON A SINGLE PROJECT. THAT CAN BRING THAT BLENDING PLANT INTO THE AREA TO DO 24 RUBBERIZED 25 ASPHALT, AND WE'RE GOING TO ENCOURAGE THE CITIES

1	TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE INSPECTION AND TO PERFORM THE
2	PAVEMENT TESTING AND ANALYSIS PRIOR TO DOING THE
3	PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
4	I BELIEVE THAT YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE A
5	FIRM FOUNDATION FOR ANY STRUCTURE. A ROADWAY IS A
6	STRUCTURE; A HOUSE IS A STRUCTURE. IF YOU BUILD A
7	HOUSE ON A LANDSLIDE AND DIDN'T REALIZE YOU'RE
8	GOING TO HAVE A PROBLEM WHICH IS GOING TO RUIN THE
9	WHOLE HOUSE, RIGHT? IF YOU BUILD A HOUSE ROAD AND
10	YOU DON'T BUILD A PROPER ROAD STRUCTURE, YOU'RE
11	WASTING YOUR MONEY. IT'S NOT GOING TO LAST SO
12	LONG AS YOU THOUGHT IT WOULD OR YOU'RE OVER-
13	COMPENSATING BY PROVIDING MORE THAN YOU NEED.
14	AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, THE PAVEMENT TESTING.
15	ANALYSIS IS VERY INEXPENSIVE.
16	\$5,000 PER MILE IS A MAXIMUM COST THAT WE RUN
17	INTO, AND I'VE CHECKED WITH SEVERAL CONSULTANTS
18	AND THEY AGREE WITH THAT. SO I'M GOING TO
19	ENCOURAGE THE CITIES TO DO THIS, GET THE INITIAL
20	STEP WHERE THEY START RUNNING ON A PROJECT. I'LL
21	GET INTO PROJECTION OF EXPENSES. WE'VE ACTUALLY
22	ONLY BILLED ABOUT \$12,000 SO FAR, BUT WE'VE SPENT
23	ABOUT \$70,000, AND THE REASON THAT THE FULL
24 25	\$70,000 HASN'T BEEN BILLED IS BECAUSE OF THE VARIOUS POSTING DATES ON THE CHARGES.

1	WE'RE GOING THROUGH THE COUNTY'S
2	FINANCIAL SYSTEM AND EVERYTHING NOTHING GETS
3	BILLED UNTIL IT ACTUALLY HITS. AS YOU CAN SEE
4	THERE, WE'VE GOT ABOUT \$50,000 EXPENDED IN STAFF
5	TIME. THE BROCHURES, WORKBOOKS AND BOOTH DISPLAY
6	COSTS ABOUT \$14,000. THE CONSULTANT WE HAD DOING
7	THAT HAS A CONTRACT WITH THE COUNTY JUST SUBMITTED
8	HIS BILL TWO WEEKS AGO, SO THAT WILL BE HITTING
9	CONFERENCES, TRAVEL, WORKSHOP ANOTHER SIX, SO
10	WE'VE SPENT ABOUT \$70,000. PROJECTED EXPENSES
11	THROUGH NOVEMBER OF '98, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU'RE
12	FAMILIAR WITH THE VARIOUS TASKS THAT WE HAVE, BUT
13	BASICALLY THEY'RE CONSULTATION SERVICES,
14	WORKSHOPS, SETTING UP A WEB SITE, STATUS REPORTS,
15	THAT KIND OF THINGS.
16	AND I'VE GONE THROUGH AND ESTIMATED
17	THE TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES THROUGH NOVEMBER
18	OF '98, WHICH IS 410,000 OUT OF THE 500,000 THAT
19	WAS BUDGETED FOR THIS PROGRAM. RECOMMENDATIONS
20	FOR FUTURE FOR '97-'98 ALLOCATION IF I MIGHT.
21	I'VE TALKED A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THIS WITH STAFF,
22	BUT NOT REALLY IN DETAIL, SO THEY'RE NOT REALLY
23	AWARE OF WHAT I'M PROPOSING, BUT I WOULD LIKE YOU
24 25	TO CONSIDER IT. AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, ONE OF THE

1	PROBLEMS THAT THE CITIES HAVE IS THAT THEY'RE NOT
2	DOING THE ENGINEERING BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE THE
3	MONEY OR THEY PERCEIVE THEY DON'T HAVE THE MONEY
4	TO DO THE ENGINEERING. AS YOU CAN SEE FROM OUR
5	EXPENDITURES, OUR PROPOSED ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES
6	THROUGH FOR ANOTHER YEAR, WE'RE NOT GOING TO
7	SPEND, I DON'T BELIEVE, THE FULL \$500,000, BUT I
8	WOULD LIKE TO EXTEND THE PROGRAM FOR ANOTHER YEAR
9	AT \$150,000 TO COVER THE CENTER'S EXPENSES FOR
10	THAT ADDITIONAL YEAR, INCLUDING THE HUNDRED
11	THOUSAND WE'RE NOT GOING TO SPEND, OR IN ADDITION
12	TO THE HUNDRED THOUSAND WE'RE NOT GOING TO SPEND,
13	AND THEN SET ASIDE SOME MONEY AND I'VE BEEN
14	OFFERED A SUGGESTION OF \$350,000 TO BE USED TO
15	HELP THE CITIES GET INTO RUBBERIZED ASPHALT
16	CONCRETE PROJECTS. A LOT OF THEM WOULD LIKE TO
17	USE IT, BUT THEY CAN'T SELL IT BECAUSE IT COSTS
18	MORE PER TON. IF THEY DO THE ENGINEERING TO FIND
19	OUT AS YOU CAN SEE IN MY WORKBOOK, MY
20	CALCULATIONS, THAT WHILE IT COSTS MORE PER TON,
21	THEY CAN SAVE A BUNCH OF MONEY ON PROJECTS, UP TO
22	HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ON A MAJOR HIGHWAY
23	RESURFACE, OR A MILLION DOLLARS IF RUBBERIZED
24 25	ASPHALT IS PROPER FOR FULL RECONSTRUCTION. I THINK THEY'RE NOT DOING THIS

1	BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW THAT IT'S REALLY
2	COST-EFFECTIVE FOR THEM TO DO THIS. MY PROPOSAL,
3	MY RECOMMENDATION FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION IS THAT
4	OUT OF THE \$500,000 THAT WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE
5	CENTER, YOU TAKE 350,000 OF THAT AND USE THAT TO
6	HELP THESE CITIES DO THAT UP-FRONT ENGINEERING
7	STUDY AT A MAXIMUM COST OF \$5,000. THAT WOULD
8	GIVE YOU 70 PROJECTS ON BOARD; AND IF EACH PROJECT
9	IS 5 TO 10,000, THAT'S, WHAT, 350 TO 700,000 TONS
10	OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT THAT WE'RE PUTTING DOWN, AND
11	EACH TON USES THREE TIRES, SO YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT
12	TWO MILLION TIRES USED.
13	I MEAN, THE NUMBERS ARE REALLY
14	TREMENDOUS IF YOU CAN GET THE CITIES, GIVE THEM AN
15	INCENTIVE TO START USING THIS. MY PROPOSAL WOULD
16	BE TO SET ASIDE UP TO \$5,000 PER PROJECT FOR THIS
17	UP-FRONT ENGINEERING. IN TALKING WITH CAREN, I
18	PROPOSED THAT RATHER THAN HAVING THE BOARD STAFF
19	ANALYZE WHAT CITIES SHOULD GET THIS, I WOULD
20	CONTACT EACH CITY AND GIVE THEM A FORM TO FILL OUT
21	OR AN OPTION TO HIRE A CONSULTANT OR DO THE WORK
22	IN-HOUSE WITH THE IDEA THAT ONCE THEIR PROJECT IS
23	APPROVED AND I COULD APPROVE THAT IF YOU WOULD
24 25	LIKE THAT THE BOARD WOULD THEN REIMBURSE THEM FOR THEIR COST OF THAT STUDY UP TO \$5,000, AND I

```
THINK IT WOULD BE A GREAT INCENTIVE FOR THE CITIES
1
 2
       TO GET -- START USING THE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT.
                      IN ADDITION, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT
 3
 4
       WHEN COUNTIES ADMINISTER JOINT PROJECTS, THERE'S
 5
       SOME UP-FRONT COST, ADMINISTRATION COST THAT
       REALLY DOESN'T BENEFIT THE COUNTY A WHOLE LOT, AND
 6
       I WOULD PROPOSE THAT YOU MIGHT CONSIDER PROVIDING
       UP TO $5,000 PER PROJECT TO ALAMEDA COUNTY, FOR
8
9
       EXAMPLE, AS THEY GET PROJECTS WITHIN CITIES, JOINT
10
       PROJECTS WHERE YOU CAN GET THE TONNAGE UP. ONCE
       YOU GET THE CITIES TO START USING THIS, IT'S GOING
11
       TO GO LIKE WILD FIRE.
12
                      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, ABOUT 70
13
       PERCENT OR 80 PERCENT OF OUR RESURFACING PROJECTS
14
15
       USE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE. FIVE YEARS AGO,
       IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN 5 PERCENT, BUT WE STARTED USING
16
17
       IT, WE REALIZE HOW MUCH MONEY WE'RE SAVING, AND
       WE'RE GOING TO KEEP ON USING IT, AND AS THE
18
       PRODUCT GETS STARTED USING MORE AND MORE, THE
19
20
       QUALITY CONTROL GETS BETTER, THE MORE CONTRACTORS
       ARE FAMILIAR WITH IT, SO IT'S KIND OF A
21
       MUSHROOMING THING. YOU START AND IT KEEPS GOING
22
23
       AND IT KEEPS GOING.
24
                      ANYWAY, I'VE TAKEN UP A LOT OF YOUR
25
       TIME, BUT I DID WANT TO GET THROUGH THIS. I DO
```

1	THINK THAT THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES IS THE
2	VEHICLE FOR THIS TYPE OF A PROGRAM. IN TALKING
3	WITH CITIES AND COUNTIES, FIRST OF ALL, WE HAVE TO
4	TELL THEM WE'RE NOT SELLING ANYTHING BECAUSE THEY
5	DON'T BELIEVE US THAT WE'RE NOT A COUNTY
6	ORGANIZATION. WE HAVE TO STRESS THAT, BUT WHEN
7	THEY DO REALIZE THAT, THEY FEEL A LITTLE BETTER
8	BECAUSE THEY KNOW THAT WE'RE NOT PROMOTING ASPHALT
9	OR A PRODUCT IN ORDER TO MAKE MONEY FOR THE
10	COUNTY. WE'RE PROMOTING IT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
11	REASONS, WE'RE PROMOTING IT BECAUSE YOU'VE SEEN
12	FIT TO FUND US, WHICH IS GREAT, AND I THINK THAT
13	THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES IS PROBABLY THE BEST
14	AGENCY TO DO THIS TYPE OF THING, AND I WOULD
15	RECOMMEND THAT THE PROGRAM BE EXTENDED, MY
16	RECOMMENDATIONS AS FAR AS HOW THE MONEY WOULD
BE	
17	ALLOCATED BE CONSIDERED. SO THANK YOU.
18	CHAIRMAN JONES: DOES ANYBODY HAVE ANY
19	QUESTIONS FOR MR. NICHOLSON?
20	MEMBER RELIS: NOT A QUESTION AT THIS
21	POINT, BUT MORE WHEN YOU'RE READY, I HAVE
SOME	
22	COMMENTS.
23	CHAIRMAN JONES: ANY QUESTIONS?
24	MEMBER PENNINGTON: NO, I DON'T HAVE

ANY

25 QUESTIONS.

1	CHAIRMAN JONES: I HAVE A COUPLE OF
2	QUESTIONS.
3	I KNOW THIS WAS A TIGHTLY WRITTEN
4	AGREEMENT, KIND OF LIMITED ON WHAT YOU CAN DO.
5	THE INSPECTIONS THAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT THAT
6	YOU DIDN'T THINK WERE PART OF THE PROCESS AND
7	PROBABLY WEREN'T PART OF THE PROJECT, BUT IF IF
8	YOU PERFORMED THOSE THINGS, IF YOU WENT OUT, YOU
9	KNOW, AND DID A FIRST CUT TO MAKE SURE THEY HAD
10	ALL THE STUFF IN PLACE AND THEY KNEW WHAT WAS
11	GOING ON, THAT HELPS SELL SELL THE SUCCESS
12	HELPS SELL RUBBERIZED ASPHALT.
13	MR. NICHOLSON: THAT'S RIGHT.
14	CHAIRMAN JONES: IS THERE ENOUGH TIME TO
15	ADD THAT? LET'S SAY THAT WE LOOK AT YOUR
16	RECOMMENDATION. DOES PART OF IT INCLUDE
17	MR. NICHOLSON: YES.
18	CHAIRMAN JONES: YOUR TIME DOING THE
19	INITIAL INSPECTION AND SOME HELP DURING THE
20	PROJECT?
21	MR. NICHOLSON: YES. I BUDGETED A
22	HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS THIS YEAR FOR ON-SITE
23	ASSISTANCE. THAT'S A LOT OF A LOT OF TRIPS, SO
24 25	YES. THE BUDGET THAT I'VE ESTIMATED SPENDING THROUGH NOVEMBER OF '98, THE 410,000 INCLUDES

```
1
       THAT. THE ADDITIONAL 150,000 THAT I'VE PROPOSED
 2
       WOULD ALSO INCLUDE THAT.
 3
                      WE SPENT A LOT OF TIME AND MONEY IN
 4
       GETTING UP AND RUNNING HERE. THE BOOTH DISPLAYS,
 5
       THE BROCHURES, THE WORKBOOKS HAVE ALL TAKEN A LOT
       OF TIME, BUT I THOUGHT THAT IT WAS VERY NECESSARY
 6
       TO MAKE THE CITIES AND COUNTIES AWARE OF WHAT WE
 7
 8
       CAN OFFER BEFORE WE HIT 'EM COLD.
                CHAIRMAN JONES: I AGREE WITH YOU. I
 9
       THINK IT'S IMPORTANT. I LOOKED THROUGH -- I
10
       DIDN'T -- I DIDN'T TAKE YOUR THING BECAUSE I
11
       THOUGHT I HAD ONE, I DIDN'T HAVE THE GREEN PAGES,
12
13
       BUT, YOU KNOW, YOU TALK A LOT ABOUT REGIONALIZE.
       AND OBVIOUSLY IF YOU'VE GOT THE EQUIPMENT IN A
14
15
       REGION, THEN THERE'S A BENEFIT TO THOSE WHO USE
16
       IT.
17
                MR. NICHOLSON: RIGHT.
18
                CHAIRMAN JONES: IS THERE A WAY TO
19
       PROMOTE THAT WHEN YOU'RE GOING OUT AND DOING YOUR
       REGIONAL WORKSHOPS? YOU'VE GOT A LOT OF EXAMPLES
20
       OF WHERE THERE'S COST SAVINGS AND STUFF. ARE YOU
21
       ABLE TO TAILOR -- WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO TAILOR
22
23
       THOSE, WHERE YOU WENT IN AND DID A WORKSHOP AND
```

YOU KNEW THAT THERE WERE ITEMS IN FOUR OR FIVE OF

THESE SURROUNDING CITIES THAT --

24

25

1	MR. NICHOLSON: OH, CERTAINLY.
2	CHAIRMAN JONES: WOULD HELP YOU, WOULD
3	HELP EVERYBODY IN PROMOTING THIS?
4	MR. NICHOLSON: THE ALAMEDA COUNTY WASTE
5	MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP, WHICH WOULD BE HELD NOVEMBER
6	5TH, HAD 108 PEOPLE FROM THE 14 CITIES AND THE
7	COUNTY THERE, AND AS A RESULT OF THAT, PLUS MY
8	PREVIOUS WORKSHOP WITH ALAMEDA COUNTY, THE COUNTY
9	IS PUTTING TOGETHER PROGRAMS WHERE THEY CAN
10	REGIONALIZE THE PROJECT. AND WE USED THE
11	WORKSHOP USED A PERSON FROM GRANITE CONSTRUCTION,
12	RAJKA WAJZI, WHO DID ONE OF THE PRESENTATIONS, AND
13	HIS COMPANY HAS A BLENDING UNIT TO BLEND THE
14	RUBBER WITH THE ASPHALT, BUT IT'S AN AFFORDABLE
15	UNIT, BUT IT COSTS ABOUT \$10,000 TO BRING INTO AN
16	AREA. SO IF YOU CAN DO A 10,000 TON PROJECT, THE
17	COST OF TRANSPORTING THE EQUIPMENT IS ONLY A
18	DOLLAR A TON.
19	CHAIRMAN JONES: RIGHT.
20	MR. NICHOLSON: YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET
21	THAT KIND OF A PRESS BECAUSE CONTRACTORS THAT
22	AREN'T FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT ARE GOING TO BID
23	A LITTLE HIGHER. WE'RE GETTING PRICES IN L.A.
24 25	COUNTY FOR \$39 TO \$40 A TON FOR SIX-TO TEN-TON PROJECTS.

```
1
                CHAIRMAN JONES: I WENT THROUGH YOUR --
 2
       YOU FOLKS HAVE SPENT ABOUT TWO MILLION, ALMOST
 3
        $2,300,000 ON THESE PROJECTS, BUT GOT RID OF
        51,000 TONS OF MATERIAL. THAT'S PRETTY IMPRESSIVE
 4
 5
       AND THEY'RE REGIONAL AND IT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE.
       YOUR RANGES GO FROM $60 TO 41, I THINK, FOR AN
 6
       AVERAGE COST OF $45 A TON.
 7
 8
                MR. NICHOLSON: THAT'S ONLY ONE MONTH'S
 9
       WORTH.
                CHAIRMAN JONES: RIGHT, AND I THINK
10
       THAT'S IMPORTANT. THAT'S WHAT WE DO HERE ALL THE
11
       TIME IS LET PEOPLE KNOW WHAT THE ADVANTAGES ARE TO
12
13
       DIFFERENT -- TO CHANGE, YOU KNOW, AND --
14
                MR. NICHOLSON: RIGHT.
15
                CHAIRMAN JONES: -- IT'S IMPORTANT.
16
                MR. NICHOLSON: IF I MIGHT? THAT'S ONE
       OF THE REASONS THAT THAT PAVEMENT EVALUATION STUDY
17
18
       IS SO IMPORTANT, BECAUSE ONCE THE RESULTS COME IN,
       AND IF YOU SEE MY EXAMPLE, IT REQUIRES 4 INCHES OF
19
       CONVENTIONAL ASPHALT. IF YOU CAN SAVE A LANE MILE
20
       BY USING RUBBERIZED, THEY WON'T KNOW THAT, AND
21
       THERE'S SO MANY CITIES THAT DON'T DO IT.
22
23
                     I'M NOT PROPOSING THAT WE DO IT FOR
24
        'EM, BUT THEY SHOULD DO IT OR HIRE A CONSULTANT.
       THERE'S A LOT OF PEOPLE THAT CAN DO THAT.
25
```

1	CHAIRMAN JONES: AND WE SHOULD PAY FOR
2	IT.
3	MR. NICHOLSON: THAT'S POSSIBLE AS AN
4	INCENTIVE TOO.
5	CHAIRMAN JONES: I'M GIVING YOU A BAD
6	TIME. THAT'S MY NATURE. THANK YOU.
7	MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR?
8	CHAIRMAN JONES: MR. RELIS.
9	MEMBER RELIS: I'D LIKE TO JUST GO BACK
10	AND PUT THIS PROJECT IN PERSPECTIVE, AND I'VE BEEN
11	A STRONG PROPONENT OF THIS EFFORT, AND AS YOU
12	KNOW, VISITED YOUR FACILITY
13	MR. NICHOLSON: YES.
14	MEMBER RELIS: AND FEEL THAT THIS
15	OFFERED THE BOARD A REAL OPPORTUNITY TO DO KIND OF
16	THE I'LL JUST DRAW THE ANALOGY TO LIKE THE
17	COMPOST DEVELOPMENT WE'VE DONE. WE'VE ENTERED
18	INTO A MULTI-YEAR EFFORT TO DEVELOP A MARKET THAT
19	DIDN'T EXIST. IT WASN'T VERY STRONG WHEN THAT
20	PROJECT BEGAN.
21	I'M NOT SAYING THAT THE PROJECT
22	CREATED THE MARKET COMPLETELY BY ANY STRETCH, BUT
23	IT WAS A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR. YOU KNOW, I GOT
24 25	EXCITED TODAY WHEN YOU STARTED YOUR PRESENTATION TAKING US BACK TO THE TIME WHEN MY EYES LIT UP

```
1
       WHEN YOU -- YOU MENTIONED THAT THIS COULD GENERATE
 2
       MAYBE A COUPLE OF MILLION TIRE MARKET PULL,
 3
       BECAUSE AFTER ALL, AGAIN, THAT'S WHAT THIS BOARD
 4
       IS AFTER, RESULTS.
 5
                      WE -- SO WHEN I FIRST GOT THE
       BRIEFING ON THIS AND THEN THEY READ THE ITEM, YOU
 6
       KNOW, THERE'S NOTHING THAT COMES OUT AT ME THAT
 7
 8
       PUTS THE -- THESE KINDS OF NUMBERS OUT THERE AND A
       TRACK THAT GETS US WHERE I THINK YOU WANT TO GO --
 9
10
                 MR. NICHOLSON: UH-HUH.
                 MEMBER RELIS: -- BASED ON WHAT YOU'VE
11
12
       SAID.
13
                      THE INFORMATION SUGGESTS THIS IS A
14
       GOOD BUY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT. WE'RE NOT JUST
15
       FOISTING SOMETHING ON THEM THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY
16
       ECONOMIC SENSE. SO THE REAL QUESTION THEN IS HOW
       DO WE -- BOTH FROM A REPORTING PERSPECTIVE AND OUR
17
18
       DELIBERATION ABOUT WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO COMMIT
19
       NEW FUNDS, HOW DO WE SEE THE WHOLE GAME PLAN HERE
       AND HOW THAT'S UNFOLDING. AND MY SUGGESTION --
20
       JUST TODAY, YOU'VE PRESENTED AN IDEA THAT MIGHT
21
       HELP KICK START THE ACTUAL USE.
22
23
                      I DON'T THINK STAFF HEARD THAT.
24
       WE'RE JUST HEARING THAT FOR THE FIRST TIME.
25
                 MR. NICHOLSON: THAT'S RIGHT.
```

1	MEMBER RELIS: IT SEEMS TO ME THAT NEEDS
2	SOME FURTHER WORK, BUT I KNOW OUR TIMELINE'S TIGHT
3	ON THE ISSUE OF COMMITTING FUTURE FUNDS, BUT IT
4	SEEMS TO ME THAT WE NEED TO DO SOME MORE WORK ON
5	THAT TO GET A COMFORT LEVEL WITH WHERE YOU WANT TO
6	GO AND SQUARE THAT.
7	I'D LIKE TO SEE IF WE COULD GET SOME
8	NUMBERS OUT HERE ABOUT AGAIN PUTTING THAT TWO
9	MILLION OR WHATEVER THE NUMBERS IN A TIMELINE THAT
10	WOULD GIVE YOU A TARGET TO GO FOR AND NOT AND
11	THE BOARD A GREATER SENSE, PERHAPS, OF
12	ACCOUNTABILITY FROM A NUMBER CRUNCHING SIDE.
13	I'D LIKE TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE
14	INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEM WHICH YOU'VE IDENTIFIED ON
15	PAGE 2 OF YOUR REPORT WHICH SAYS BASICALLY WE ONLY
16	HAVE ONE CRUMB-RUBBER PRODUCER
17	MR. NICHOLSON: THAT'S RIGHT.
18	MEMBER RELIS: RIGHT NOW. WE DON'T
19	WANT TO BE USING TIRES FROM OUT OF STATE. THAT
20	WILL NOT EXACTLY THAT'S NOT AN EXCITING
21	PROSPECT GIVEN WHAT WE'RE INVESTING HERE. I DON'T
22	THINK WE WE COULD JUSTIFY THAT, FRANKLY, SO I
23	THINK WE NEED TO SEE THE INFRASTRUCTURE CONNECT
24 25	AND I THINK THAT THE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROPOSED NEW DEMAND MIGHT ATTRACT THE PARTIES

TO PERHAPS DEVELOP FURTHER THIS CAPACITY. 1 2 I DON'T KNOW THAT FOR SURE. I DON'T THINK ANY OF US HAVE THAT WITHIN OUR -- HAVE THAT 3 4 CONTROL OR INSIGHT AT THAT LEVEL. BUT -- AND THEN FINALLY I'D LIKE TO SEE WHAT OUR STAFF ROLE IS IN 5 THIS, BECAUSE IF YOU FRAME THIS, THIS IS 6 ANOTHER LIKE GRASSCYCLING, LIKE THE COMPOST DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS A PARTNERSHIP ROLE BETWEEN 8 THE BOARD -- IN OTHER WORDS, AS ENVISIONED IN 9 AB-939, THE STATE WORKING WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. 10 L.A. COUNTY IS OUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT VEHICLE FOR 11 FURTHERING THIS PARTNERSHIP. SO WHAT'S IT GOING 12 TO TAKE TO MAKE THIS PARTNERSHIP WORK? 13 HAVE A ROLE AT THE STAFF; NOT JUST AS CONTRACT 14 15 MONITORS WHERE WE'RE PASSIVELY MAYBE WATCHING WHAT YOU'RE DOING AND COMMENTING ON IT, BUT WHAT 16 ARE WE ACTIVELY DOING TO PROVIDE FURTHER ENERGY, 17 ASSISTANCE, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE? I DON'T GET A 18 SENSE OF WHAT OUR ROLE IS IN MAKING THIS WORK 19 20 RIGHT. 21 MS. TRGOVCICH: MAYBE, MEMBER RELIS, I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THAT FOR A MINUTE AND TAKE YOU 22 BACK TO THE DELIBERATIONS OF LAST APRIL ABOUT 23 BOTH

THE ALLOCATION 6-7 DOLLARS AND THE FUTURE 7-8

24

DOLLARS THAT WE'RE NOW DISCUSSING. AT THAT TIME

WE DISCUSSED THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NUMBER 1 2 OF ACTIVITIES THAT THE BOARD APPROVED. AS YOU'LL REMEMBER, WE HAD 500,000 FOR THE CENTER. WE HAVE 3 4 A BIANNUAL CONFERENCE THAT WE ARE NOW PREPARING. WE HAVE THREE GRANT PROGRAMS THAT ARE ON THE 5 STREET RIGHT NOW. WE HAVE TWO PRIOR FISCAL YEAR 6 7 GRANT PROGRAMS THAT ARE CURRENTLY MOVING THROUGH THE PROCESS AND A LIST OF ABOUT 15 OTHER 8 ACTIVITIES. ONE OF THE GOALS OF CONTRACTING WITH 9 THE STATEWIDE CENTER WITH L.A. WAS TO BE ABLE TO 10 GET INCREASED SUPPORT WITHOUT INCREASING THE STAFF 11 WORKLOAD, SO WHAT I'M TRYING TO SAY TO YOU IS 12 13 THERE IS NOT A STRONG STAFF ROLE AS IT RELATES TO THE CENTER BECAUSE IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THAT WAS 14 15 GOING TO BE THE CENTER'S ROLE. MEMBER RELIS: OKAY. 16 MS. TRGOVCICH: THERE ARE A VERY LIMITED 17 NUMBER OF STAFF THROUGH THE TIRE FUND TO DO A LOT 18 OF JOBS NOT JUST TO MARKET DEVELOPMENT, BUT TO 19 20 PERMITTING TIRE HAULER REGISTRATION, ET CETERA. WE WERE LOOKING AT THE CENTER AS A WAY OF 21 OFFSETTING THOSE STAFF WORKLOAD ISSUES. 22 MEMBER RELIS: OKAY. SO THAT'S A CLEAR 23 MESSAGE. I MEAN, THAT'S HELPFUL TO GET A 24 REMINDER

ON OUR OBLIGATION AND OUR EXPECTATION AS WE WENT

- 1 INTO THIS. I GUESS I SPOKE TO THAT MORE OF -- I
- 2 DON'T KNOW -- FEELING PERHAPS WHETHER OUR ROLE'S
- 3 DIRECT OR NOT, A SENSE THAT THIS IS

SOMETHING THAT

- 4 WE WANT TO SUPPORT. I GUESS THE -- IT'S NOT THAT
- 5 I'M ASKING FOR A STAFF COMMITMENT OF ADDITIONAL
 - 6 TIME --
 - 7 MR. CHANDLER: LET ME ADDRESS YOUR

POINT

- 8 BECAUSE I THINK IT'S RIGHT ON. CAREN SAID
 LET ME
- 9 TAKE YOU BACK TO APRIL. LET ME TAKE YOU BACK TO
- 10 THE LAST BOARD MEETING. I THINK WHAT YOU'RE
- 11 ASKING FOR IS WE NEED A BIT OF A -- THIS IS
- 12 OVERPHRASING IT, PERHAPS, BUT A BIT OF A
- 13 STRATEGIC PLAN WHERE YOU SEE THE PERFORMANCE
- 14 MEASURES --
- 15 MEMBER RELIS: EXACTLY.
- MR. CHANDLER: -- CLEARLY LAID OUT,

WHAT

- 17 WE CAN EXPECT THIS CENTER TO ASSIST US IN.
- 18 WHILE CAREN'S CORRECT, WE DON'T HAVE A LOT

OF THAT

- 19 WE'RE GOING TO IMMEDIATELY THROW AT
- DEVELOPING A
- 20 HUGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND TIRES, I DO THINK

THAT

21 WHAT YOU'RE ASKING FOR IS THAT CITY STAFF

LEVEL

- 22 ALONG WITH MR. NICHOLSON COULD SIT DOWN AND
- 23 PROVIDE A LITTLE BIT MORE DEFINITION AS TO

WHAT

24 OUTCOMES OR WHAT PERFORMANCE MEASURES WE

WANTED TO

25 STRIVE FOR IN THE COMING MONTHS AS IT RELATES TO

1	THE NUMBER OF AGREEMENTS.
2	YOU MENTIONED THE POTENTIAL 70
3	AGREEMENTS GIVEN THE BUDGETS, AND FROM THOSE
4	AGREEMENTS, HOW MANY TIRES WOULD BE USED OR HOW
5	MANY THAT WE THINK COULD ACTUALLY BRING IN A
6	TONNAGE WAY APPLICATION OF THIS MATERIAL, YOU
7	KNOW, TO BEAR. SO I THINK WHAT WE'RE LOOKING
FOR,	
8	WHAT YOU'RE ASKING FOR, WE'RE STARTING TO SEE
THIS	
9	COME TOGETHER, BUT WE NEED TO PUT A LITTLE BIT
10	MORE DEFINITION BEHIND THE PLAN WITH SOME
11	PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN THERE, AND I THINK THAT'S
12	WHAT WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT HAVING SOME PROGRAM
13	OR WASTESTREAMS ON DECK AS WE GO THROUGH THE
14	PLANNING PROCESS IN THE MODEL THAT WE'VE BEEN
15	TALKING ABOUT, THAT'S THAT'S THE ANALYSIS THAT
16	YOU'RE ASKING FOR.
17	YOU'D LIKE TO SEE HOW THIS THESE
18	FUTURE GOALS AND THE ALLOCATION OF FUTURE FUNDING
19	STARTS TO LAY OUT AND WHAT WE REALLY ARE GOING TO
20	GET FOR OUR DOLLAR IN THE FORM OF RUBBERIZED
21	ASPHALT ON THE GROUND APPLIED. AND I THINK
THAT'S	
22	A ROLE THAT THE CENTER PROBABLY IS SEEING AS A

23	LITTLE BIT BROADER AS MAYBE THEIR TECHNICAL
24	ASSISTANCE ROLE, BUT I THINK IN A COMBINATION
25	WITH STAFF HELP AND MR. NICHOLSON'S BACKGROUND,
WE	

1 COULD PUT THAT DEFINITION TOGETHER WHERE -- I SEE 2 THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION IS TO COME BACK AT A 3 FUTURE TIME, MAYBE COME BACK AT A FUTURE TIME IN 4 CONJUNCTION WITH THE CONTRACTOR WHERE WE PUT A 5 LITTLE BIT MORE DEFINITION TOGETHER AS TO WHAT ACTUALLY WE SEE AS OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES THAT WE WANT 6 7 TO -- THAT WE WANT TO STRIVE FOR IN THE COMING 8 MONTHS. 9 MEMBER RELIS: AND AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THERE ISN'T THAT MUCH TIME BECAUSE WE'RE -- WE'RE 10 RIGHT UP AGAINST THIS OTHER ALLOCATION ISSUE. 11 12 CHAIRMAN JONES: RIGHT. 13 MEMBER RELIS: AND A SUGGESTION HAS BEEN MADE ABOUT HOW TO USE THAT MONEY, BUT I DON'T HAVE 14 15 A COMFORT LEVEL YET THAT WE HAVE THAT TYPE OF 16 STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT. MR. NICHOLSON: RIGHT. COULD I SAY 17 18 SOMETHING? I PUT FORTH THE SUGGESTION OR THE 19 RECOMMENDATION TO PUT SOME UP-FRONT MONEY TO THE CITIES FOR -- TO -- TO KIND OF FORCE THEM INTO 20 21 DOING THE STUDY TO MAKE SURE THAT RUBBERIZED 22 ASPHALT WAS FOR THEM. 23 I DON'T WANT TO PUSH THIS AND I 24 DON'T THINK YOU WANT TO PUSH THE PRODUCT IF IT 25 ISN'T GOING TO DO A GOOD JOB FOR THEM.

1	IT TAKES ABOUT SIX MONTHS TO GET A
2	PROJECT GOING. I MEAN THAT'S MINIMUM FOR MOST
3	CITIES AND COUNTIES BY THE TIME THEY BUDGET THE
4	MONEY FOR THE PROJECT, AND IT COULD BE LONGER, AND
5	I DON'T I'M NOT RECOMMENDING OR SUGGESTING THAT
6	YOU HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION RIGHT AWAY OR ANYTHING
7	LIKE THAT, BUT KEEP IN MIND THAT IF YOU DO LIKE
8	THE IDEA OF PROVIDING MONETARY ASSISTANCE TO DO
9	THIS UP-FRONT WORK, THAT IT WILL HAVE TO GET THE
10	WORD OUT TO THE CITIES, THEY WILL HAVE TO DEVELOP
11	PROJECTS WHICH CAN DO THAT, SO IT WOULD BE GOOD IF
12	WE COULD GET PROJECTS ON BOARD FOR NEXT SUMMER OR
13	THE SUMMER AFTER, YOU KNOW.
14	I DON'T IMAGINE THAT THERE'S
15	WELL, THERE'S PROBABLY A LOT OF WORK HERE IN
16	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, BUT NOT NEARLY AS MUCH AS WE
17	HAVE IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. SO THERE IS IT'S
18	NOT A TIME PROBLEM, BUT I JUST WANTED TO MAKE YOU
19	AWARE THAT THERE IS AT LEAST A SIX-MONTH
20	PREPARATION TIME FOR PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND
21	AWARD OF CONTRACTS. AND MY PROPOSAL WOULD NOT
22	INCREASE CAREN'S STAFF TIME AND THAT WE WOULD
23	DO THE CENTER WOULD DO THE EVALUATION OF THE
24 25	PROJECT AND RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD ALLOCATE MONEY TO THE CITY UPON AWARD OF THE PROJECT. IN

- OTHER WORDS, THE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IS A COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTION AND THEY ADVERTISE THE
- PROJECT,
- 3 THEN THEY WOULD GET THE MONEY, AND THAT'S WHAT I
- 4 WAS THINKING.
- 5 NOW, RUBBERIZED ASPHALT MAY NOT BE

Α

6 COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTION. THAT'S A CHANCE YOU

HAVE

7 TO TAKE, BUT I'M SUGGESTING THAT THIS PROPOSAL

BE

- 8 ONLY USED FOR RURAL HIGHWAYS, MAJOR HIGHWAYS,
- 9 SECONDARY HIGHWAYS, AND HIGH VOLUME CONNECTORS,
- 10 NOT RESIDENTIAL STREETS BECAUSE RUBBERIZED

ASPHALT

- 11 IS REALLY NOT COST-EFFECTIVE FOR LOCAL STREETS.
- 12 MEMBER RELIS: CAN I ASK YOU A

TECHNICAL

- 13 QUESTION?
- MR. NICHOLSON: YES.
- 15 MEMBER RELIS: I THOUGHT YOU SAID ON

THAT

- 16 LAST POINT THAT IF YOU USED A SLURRY SEAL ON
- 17 RESIDENTIAL STREETS EVERY FIVE YEARS, IF I

RECALL

18 CORRECTLY, THEN YOU WOULD HAVE SUSTAINED

19	MAINTENANCE; IN OTHER WORDS, THOSE STREETS COULD
20	GO ON MORE OR LESS INDEFINITELY.
21	MR. NICHOLSON: THAT'S RIGHT.
22	MEMBER RELIS: DID I MISS SOMETHING,
23	THEN?
24 25	MR. NICHOLSON: NO. THE PROBLEM THAT I FOUND WITH OUR OWN COUNTY AND OUR CITIES AND THE

1	OTHER CITIES IS THAT THEY WHEN MONEY GETS
TIGHT	
2	ON THE BUDGET, THE FIRST THING TO GO IS THE
SLURRY	
3	SEAL OR THE CHIP SEAL PROGRAM. YOU KNOW THAT
IT'S	
4	FIVE YEARS SINCE YOU DID YOUR CHIP SEAL. YOU
KNOW	
5	THAT YOU SHOULD BE DOING IT, BUT YOU JUST DON'T
6	HAVE THE MONEY AND YOU'VE GOT A STREET THAT'S
7	FALLING APART, SO YOU PUT THE MONEY THERE.
8	SO A LOT OF CITIES ARE IN IN
9	FACT, I HAVE A MEETING TOMORROW IN NIPOMO, WHICH
10	IS A CITY THAT HAS RESIDENTIAL STREETS THAT HE
11	WANTS ME TO GET RECOMMENDATION, AND I HAVE A
HUNCH	
12	WHAT MY RECOMMENDATION IS GOING TO BE. HIS
13	STREETS ARE FALLING APART BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T
14	DONE THE SLURRY.
15	NOW, THAT'S PART OF WHAT THE
CENTER	
16	IS DOING IS RECOMMENDING THAT THEY DO PAVEMENT
17	MANAGEMENT ALSO. DO THE SLURRY SEAL EVERY FIVE
TO	
18	SEVEN YEARS AND WE HAVE A RUBBER THAT'S WORKING
19	VERY WELL IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, AND I THINK

COULD

20	WORK WELL IN ALL PARTS OF THE STATE. THE
21	RUBBERIZED CHIP SEALS ARE A VERY COST-EFFECTIVE
22	WAY FOR CERTAIN SITUATIONS, AND THAT'S WHAT WE
23	WOULD HELP THEM ON, IS GIVE THEM SOME ADVICE AS
TO	
24 25	WHERE CHIP SEALS OR SLURRY SEALS OR RUBBERIZED RESURFACING CAN BE USED EFFECTIVELY.

Т	I MIGHI MENIION IHAI I HAVE A REAL
2	CONCERN WITH DOING THE WORK FOR THEM BECAUSE OF
3	LIABILITIES. I DON'T THINK THAT L.A. COUNTY OR
4	THE BOARD WANTS TO GET INTO A POSITION WHERE IF
WE	
5	RECOMMEND AND DO THE DESIGN FOR RUBBERIZED
ASPHALT	
6	AND THERE'S A PROBLEM CAUSED BY SOMETHING ELSE,
7	THEY'RE GOING TO BLAME US AND YOU AND I DON'T
WANT	
8	TO GET INTO THAT.
9	IN THE WORKBOOK, YOU MAY HAVE
10	NOTICED THAT I HAVE ADDRESSED THIS ISSUE AND
THAT	
11	WE'RE PROVIDING INFORMATION WHICH IS A
COMPILA	TION
12	OF ALL OF OUR EXPERIENCES IN IT, BUT IT DOES NOT
13	GUARANTEE THAT A PARTICULAR PROJECT WILL BE
14	SUCCESSFUL. AND THAT'S WHY I'M STRESSING THE
JOB	
15	INSPECTION AND THE PLANT INSPECTION AND THE
16	UP-FRONT ENGINEERING AND ALL OF THESE THINGS GOT
17	TO BE DONE.
18	THE REASON I HAVEN'T COME UP WITH
19	TIRE FIGURES AND DOLLAR FIGURES IS HOW MANY
20	ADDITIONAL TONS OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT WE'RE

GOING

21	TO USE WOULD BE GRABBING IT FROM THE SKY. WE'VE
22	GOT TO GET INTEREST AND GET THE BALL ROLLING.
23	ONCE IT GETS ROLLING, IT WON'T STOP, BUT IT'S
VERY	
24 25	HARD TO DO A TWO MILLION TIRE FIGURE ON IT. WE CAN DO THAT, BUT LIKE I SAY, IF WE GET 70

1	PROJECTS AT 5,000 TONS EACH IN THE STATE AS A
2	RESULT OF THIS PROGRAM, THAT'S 350,000 TONS OR A
3	MILLION TIRES. WE CAN SAY THAT, BUT THATD 70
4	PROJECTS IS BASED ON GETTING THE CITIES TO DO
5	WHATEVER THEY NEED TO DO TO MAKE SURE THAT THE
6	PRODUCT IS RIGHT FOR THEM. SO
7	MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I FEEL
8	LIKE WE'RE, YOU KNOW, BASICALLY MOVING IN THE
9	RIGHT DIRECTION AND THAT I THINK THAT THE REPORT
10	WE'VE GOT THIS MORNING GIVES US EVEN A LITTLE BIT
11	MORE INFORMATION THAN WE'VE HAD PRIOR TO THIS
12	MORNING, AND I THINK THAT THE RECOMMENDATION IS
13	NOT A BAD RECOMMENDATION. I MEAN, I DON'T HAVE A
14	PROBLEM WITH IT, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE
15	STAFF KIND OF REVIEW IT AND SEE IF THAT IS THE
16	RIGHT DIRECTION OR IF THERE IS ANOTHER
17	DIRECTION IN TERMS OF AN INCENTIVE TO GET THE
18	CITIES INVOLVED.
19	SO I WOULD ASK THAT THE STAFF LOOK
20	AT THIS RECOMMENDATION AND MAYBE SOME OTHERS IN
21	TERMS OF PAYING THE DIFFERENTIAL, WHICH WAS
22	SUGGESTED. MR. NICHOLSON SEEMS TO BELIEVE THAT
23	YOU'VE GOT TO DO THIS ENGINEERING WORK FIRST, AND
24 25	I DON'T DOUBT THAT HE'S PROBABLY CORRECT. SO WHAT I WOULD I'LL MAKE A MOTION THAT WE PROCEED AND

1 ASK STAFF -- THAT WE ASK STAFF TO REVIEW THIS AND 2 BRING IT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE NEXT MONTH SO WE 3 DON'T GET BEHIND ON THE TIMELINE. 4 CHAIRMAN JONES: TO REVIEW MR. 5 NICHOLSON'S PROPOSAL. MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES. 6 MS. TRGOVCICH: WHAT WE COULD DO IS WE 7 CAN TAKE MR. RELIS' AND MR. CHANDLER'S ISSUES THAT 8 9 THEY RAISED. WE COULD TRY TO PUT SOME PROJECTIONS DOWN. I THINK LYNN MADE A VERY IMPORTANT POINT, 10 THAT AT THIS POINT IN TIME, IT'S GOING TO BE TOUGH 11 TO HOLD TO THOSE PROJECTIONS AND WE'RE GOING TO 12 13 LEARN AS WE GO, BUT THEY'RE A STARTING POINT AND THEY'RE SOMETHING TO WORK WITH, SO WE WILL ASK THE 14 15 COUNTY TO PREPARE THAT INFORMATION. WE WILL 16 PROPOSE TO COME BACK IN THE FEBRUARY TIMELINE TO BRING THIS ITEM BACK TO YOU, TO THIS COMMITTEE, 17 18 AND HOPEFULLY TO THE BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION. 19 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YOU MIGHT BRING IT BACK IN FEBRUARY, YOU SAY? 20 MS. TRGOVCICH: I WOULD PROPOSE FEBRUARY. 21 I THINK FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE HOLIDAYS, OUR 22 23 STAFF AND THE COUNTY STAFF, THE JANUARY ITEM IS 24 DUE NEXT WEEK.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT'S TRUE.

25

1	CHAIRMAN JONES: I AGREE WITH YOUR
2	MOTION. I JUST I WANT TO ASK IF WE CAN ADD TO
3	IT A LITTLE BIT. I THINK THAT THAT PART OF THE
4	PROPOSAL AND I THINK PART OF THE COMFORT LEVEL
5	WOULD BE THAT IF WE HAD A WORK PLAN AS PART OF
6	THAT SO THAT I THINK THE 70 PROJECTS NEED TO BE
7	GOALS, AND I'M A FIRM BELIEVER IN MANDATES, BUT I
8	THINK THAT THIS ONE IS A GOAL AND WE NEED TO HAVE
9	A A WORK PLAN ON SO WE CAN SO WE CAN
10	MEASURE SUCCESS BY, YOU KNOW, HOW MANY PEOPLE HAVE
11	TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF THE INSPECTION, AND I I
12	THINK IT'S HONEST AND FAIR TO SAY, YOU KNOW, YOU
13	SPEND THE FIVE GRAND ON THE INSPECTION AND THIS IS
14	NOT GOING TO WORK FOR YOU, I THINK THAT'S GOOD
15	GOVERNMENT.
16	I THINK THAT'S A SERVICE WE HAVE TO
17	PROVIDE, AND IF IT BUT I HOPE THAT YOUR
18	EXPERIENCE LETS YOU LOOK AT SOMETHING, NO, I DON'T
19	THINK WE'RE SPENDING THE FIVE GRAND ON THIS ONE
20	BECAUSE IT'S DOOMED FROM THE BEGINNING AND I'M
21	SURE THAT'S WHERE YOU WOULD BE COMING FROM, BUT I
22	THINK THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE. AND THEN WE CAN
23	MEASURE IT ON YOU KNOW, WE'VE DONE THIS
24 25	PRELIMINARY WORK. THESE THINGS ARE IN MOTION BECAUSE IT'S OUT OF OUR HANDS. IF THAT CITY

```
1
       COUNCIL OR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAYS, WE DON'T
 2
       HAVE THE DOLLARS TO DO THIS, WE'RE GOING TO PUT IT
 3
       OFF FOR TWO YEARS, THAT'S NOTHING WE CAN CONTROL.
                     I MEAN, THAT'S -- BUT I THINK THE
 4
 5
       MORE INFORMATION YOU GIVE AND THE MORE MATH THAT
       IS DONE SO THAT THEY CAN SEE A REAL SAVINGS HERE
 6
       IS A BENEFIT, AND THAT'S HOW WE MOVE IT BECAUSE
 7
 8
       ANY TIME WE CAN TAKE A RECYCLED PRODUCT AND SHOW
       VALUE, SHOW MORE VALUE, THEN IT STANDS ON ITS OWN
 9
       AND THAT -- THAT BECOMES A REAL BENEFIT. AND I
10
       THINK THAT HELPS FOSTER WHAT WE ALL ARE TRYING TO
11
       DO HERE. IF YOU WOULD ACCEPT THAT ADDITION TO THE
12
13
       WORK PLAN AND THE GOALS --
14
                MEMBER PENNINGTON: SURE.
15
                CHAIRMAN JONES: -- I'D LOVE TO SECOND
16
       YOUR MOTION.
                MEMBER PENNINGTON: ALL RIGHT.
17
18
                CHAIRMAN JONES: ANY COMMENTS OR
19
       QUESTIONS?
                MEMBER RELIS: NO. IF SOMEHOW YOU CAN
20
       CAPTURE IN YOUR DISCUSSIONS WITH LYNN, I CAN SEE
21
       YOU SEE REAL CLEARLY HOW THIS THING IS GOING TO
22
23
       SNOWBALL. YOU USED THE TERM "SNOWBALL," AND I
24
       THINK THAT'S WHAT WE WANT TO SEE.
                                          WE WANT TO SEE
25
       IT SNOWBALL. SO YOU'RE SAYING 70 PROJECTS MIGHT
```

1	BE YOU KNOW, THERE MIGHT BE SOME CRITICAL
2	NUMBER. ONCE THIS GETS OUT AND ENOUGH ENGINEERS
3	AND CITY PEOPLE, COUNTY PEOPLE HAVE EXPERIENCE
4	WITH THIS, THIS WILL BECOME A MORE REGULAR WAY OF
5	DOING BUSINESS.
6	MR. NICHOLSON: SEVENTY PROJECTS WOULD BE
7	BASICALLY 350,000 DIVIDED BY FIVE.
8	MEMBER RELIS: OKAY. HOWEVER
9	CHAIRMAN JONES: THAT'S MATH.
10	MEMBER RELIS: BUT I LIKE WHERE WE'RE
11	GOING WITH THIS.
12	CHAIRMAN JONES: GOVERNMENTAL MATH.
13	WITH THAT, WE HAVE A MOTION AND A SECOND.
14	JEANNINE, WOULD YOU LIKE TO CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE?
15	THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS?
16	MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
17	THE SECRETARY: MEMBER PENNINGTON?
18	MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE.
19	THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN JONES?
20	CHAIRMAN JONES: AYE.
21	JUST ONE BRIEF COMMENT ON THIS. WE
22	NEVER GOT A LETTER, WE NEVER GOT ANY PHONE CALL OR
23	ANYTHING, BUT THERE HAS BEEN A DISCUSSION ON
24 25	FROM THE RPA FOLKS THAT CALTRANS IS LOOKING AT A PROPOSED MIX THAT IS

1 MS. TRGOVCICH: MODIFIED BINDER 2 SPECIFICATIONS. 3 CHAIRMAN JONES: MODIFIED BINDER 4 SPECIFICATIONS WHERE IT DOESN'T HAVE TO 5 NECESSARILY BE CRUMB-RUBBER, AND I THINK WE HAVE 6 TO BE AWARE OF THAT BECAUSE THERE -- THESE ARE NOT 7 PROPOSED -- THESE ARE -- THEY'RE PROPOSED SPECS, 8 RIGHT? THEY'RE OUT WAITING COMMENT AND THINGS 9 LIKE THAT, BUT I THINK IT'S CRITICAL THAT WE NEED TO BE AWARE OF THAT, AND I THINK THAT THEY ARE 10 11 CHANGING THE MESH SPEC AS PART OF THIS TO AN AID 12 MESH. 13 MS. TRGOVCICH: I DON'T BELIEVE THEY'RE 14 CHANGING THE SPEC. I BELIEVE THE CONCERN THAT RPA 15 HAS PROPOSED IS THE MORE GENERIC SPEC AND A 16 VARIETY OF POLYMERS TO BE USED AS BINDERS WOULD PROVIDE FOR DIFFERENT SPECIFICATIONS, DIFFERENT 17 TYPES OF MATERIAL, SOME OF WHICH MAY NOT 18 CURRENTLY 19 BE AVAILABLE HERE IN CALIFORNIA, AND I BELIEVE 20 THAT'S THE CONCERN THEY'RE RAISING. 21 MEMBER RELIS: IS THIS MORE CONDUCIVE

TO

22	THE USE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT OR NOT OR
23	MS. TRGOVCICH: I DON'T KNOW.
24	MEMBER RELIS: IT CREATES MORE
25	FLEXIBILITY?

1 MS. TRGOVCICH: IT CREATES MORE 2 FLEXIBILITY IS WHAT IT DOES AND I DON'T KNOW. 3 THEY MAY HAVE MORE INFORMATION, BUT THEY'VE GONE 4 FROM A RECIPE SPECIFICATION, WHICH I BELIEVE IS 5 FOCUSED ON RUBBER TO A MORE GENERIC SPEC. MEMBER RELIS: I SEE. 6 7 MS. TRGOVCICH: I DON'T KNOW. 8 MR. GAUFF: IF YOU WANT TO ELABORATE, BASICALLY WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS WHAT THEY CALL 9 PERFORMANCE BASED SPECS, AND THAT DOESN'T PRECLUDE 10 THE USE OF RUBBER, PER SE, BUT IT'S GOING TO OPEN 11 IT UP FOR A WHOLE LOT OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF 12 13 MODIFIERS AND THE BINDERS, WHICH MAY NOT BE TIRE 14 RUBBER. 15 MS. GILDART: TENNIS BALLS. 16 MEMBER PENNINGTON: RUBBER HOSES. CHAIRMAN JONES: ANYWAY, I THINK WE NEED 17 18 TO BE AWARE OF THAT. I THINK YOU GUYS NEED TO 19 KEEP US AWARE BECAUSE THAT'S NOT AS THE BEST. I MEAN, WE'LL SEE. ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, 20 FOLKS. I THINK FROM THE SAME CREW, WE HAVE OUR 21 THIRD AGENDA ITEM, WHICH IS STATUS ON THE PUBLIC 22 23 UTILITIES COMMISSION DEREGULATION, AB-1890 OF THE 24 ELECTRIC UTILITY. THIS IS AN ORAL PRESENTATION. 25 MR. JOHNSON: THANK YOU, MEMBERS OF THE

1	COMMITTEE. THIS IS A I SHOULD APOLOGIZE TO THE
2	PEOPLE IN THE AUDIENCE. THE WRITE-UP DOESN'T
3	EASILY TRANSLATE TO THE TELEVISION SCREEN, SO
4	PLEASE BEAR WITH US.
5	THIS IS AN UPDATE OF OUR A
6	FOLLOW-UP UPDATE FROM THE SERIES THAT WAS
7	PRESENTED THIS SUMMER WHEN WE LAST MET IN
8	SEPTEMBER. THERE WAS SORT OF THREE MAJOR
9	OUTSTANDING ISSUES WITH RESPECT TO RESTRUCTURING.
10	ONE WAS WHEN THE RESTRUCTURED MARKET CAME INTO
11	BEING; SECONDLY, THE ISSUE OF THE ELECTRIC SERVICE
12	PROVIDERS BECAUSE THEY HAD JUST BEGUN REGISTERING,
13	AND THEN FINALLY THE QF CONTRACT BUYOUT ISSUE.
14	AS I SAID BEFORE, THE PURPOSE OF
15	RESTRUCTURING WAS TO WAS BASICALLY TO REDUCE
16	THE AVERAGE RETAIL PRICE IN CALIFORNIA FROM A
17	PRICE THAT WAS SIGNIFICANTLY ABOVE THE NATIONAL
18	AVERAGE DOWN MORE TOWARDS THE NATIONAL AVERAGE AND
19	TO ALLOW COMPETITION BOTH AT THE GENERATION LEVEL
20	AND AT THE LEVEL OF PROVIDING SERVICE TO THE
21	RETAIL CUSTOMERS AND MAYBE DIFFERENT SERVICES.
22	THIS REQUIRED BREAKING UP THE TRADITIONAL VERTICAL
23	MONOPOLIES OF THE UTILITIES AND CREATING TWO
24 25	ENTITIES, THE INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR TO RUN THE EXISTING TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS AND THE POWER

Т	EXCHANGE THAT WILL RUN THE GENERALION MARKET POOL.
2	THOSE TWO ENTITIES, THE ISO AND THE POWER
3	EXCHANGE, JUST RECENTLY ON OCTOBER 30TH RECEIVED
4	AN APPROVAL FROM THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY
5	COMMISSION TO BEGIN OPERATION ON JANUARY 1. FERC
6	ISSUED A I DESCRIBE IT AS A CONDITIONAL LICENSE
7	FOR THOSE ENTITIES TO BEGIN, AND WE'LL CONSIDER A
8	FINAL APPROVAL SOMETIME IN THE YEAR 2000.
9	THE ISO HAS BEGUN ACTUALLY TESTING
10	RUNNING THE TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS ON ON FIRST
11	CONDITION, SO BY JANUARY WHEN THEY TAKE OVER,
12	THEY'LL HAVE SOME GLITCHES IRONED OUT.
13	THE AS I SAY, ONE OF THE OTHER
14	MAJOR ISSUES WAS THE ELECTRIC SERVICE PROVIDERS
15	THE WHO ARE THESE PARTIES WHO WILL PROVIDE
16	SERVICES TO RETAIL CUSTOMERS. THEY WERE AB
17	1890 ALLOWED THEM TO START REGISTERING WITH THE
18	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION ON JULY 1 AND TO
19	ACTUALLY START MARKETING THEIR SERVICES ON
20	NOVEMBER 1 OF THIS YEAR. AS OF LAST WEEK, THERE
21	WERE A LITTLE OVER 200 ENTITIES WHO HAD WHO HAD
22	PAID AND RECEIVED A CERTIFICATION FROM THE PUBLIC
23	UTILITIES COMMISSION, AND THEY RUN THE GAMUT FROM
24 25	SUBSIDIARIES OF MAJOR ELECTRIC UTILITIES, BOTH IN CALIFORNIA AND ELSEWHERE.

1	AN EXAMPLE, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DUKE
2	COMPANY, SOUTHERN CAL EDISON HAS SEVERAL
3	SUBSIDIARIES WHO WILL MARKET THEIR SERVICES IN
4	PG&E'S TERRITORY AND PG&E HAS A SUBSIDIARY THAT
5	WILL INVADE EDISON'S TERRITORY, PLUS OTHERS WHO
6	ARE LOOKING AT VERY NICHE MARKETS, MAYBE
7	CHURCHES OR PEOPLE IN THE GOLF COURSE, A NUMBER OF
8	WATER DISTRICTS HAVE REGISTERED, THE CITY OF LONG
9	BEACH IN PROVIDING SERVICE TO RESIDENTIAL
10	CUSTOMERS, AND SOME OF THE BIG ONES SUCH AS ENRON
11	WHO HAVE SEVERAL SUBSIDIARIES THAT ARE REGISTERED
12	TO PROVIDE A VARIETY OF SERVICES, AND THEN THEY
13	ABOUT A DOZEN OF THE, QUOTE, GREENERS, PROBABLY
14	MOST NOTABLY GREEN MARKET OUT OF VERMONT IS DOING
15	SOME VERY IMPRESSIVE MARKETING OF RENEWABLES.
16	THE NOW, WHERE DID THESE SERVICE
17	PROVIDERS GET POWER? THEY HAVE ESSENTIALLY FOUR
18	OPTIONS, ONE OF WHICH IS TO BUY FROM THE POWER
19	EXCHANGE, WHICH IS GOING TO BE THE MAJOR
SOURCE	OF
20	POWER FOR AT LEAST THE FIRST COUPLE YEARS OF
THE	
21	TRANSITION PERIOD. THEY COULD BUY IT FROM
22	OUT-OF-STATE UTILITIES, WHICH IS WHERE A
NUMBER	OF

- THEM ARE LOOKING AT THAT, PARTICULARLY SOME OF THE
- 24 RENEWABLES BECAUSE OF -- MOST OF THE

CALIFORNIA

25 BASED RENEWABLES ARE STILL UNDER CONTRACT WITH THE

1	UTILITIES.
2	THE SERVICE PROVIDERS COULD RUN
3	THEIR OWN PLANTS. ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF
4	RESTRUCTURING IS THAT THE REGULATED UTILITIES
5	DIVEST THEMSELVES OF A NUMBER OF THEIR EXISTING
6	FOSSIL FUEL PLANTS TO REDUCE THEIR DOMINANT SHARE
7	OF THE INDUSTRY, AND THEN THE FINAL AN AREA
8	THAT WAS SOMEWHAT NEAR AND DEAR TO OUR HEART, THE
9	QUALIFYING FACILITIES WHO ARE NO LONGER WHO ARE
10	NO LONGER UNDER A UTILITY CONTRACT WOULD ALSO BE A
11	SUPPLIER, WHICH LEADS NOW TO THE MAJOR ISSUE THAT
12	WAS OUTSTANDING, AND THAT'S THE ISSUE OF
13	QUALIFYING FACILITY BUYOUTS RESTRUCTURING.
14	WHEN I WAS HERE IN THE SUMMER, YOU
15	EXPRESSED SOME REAL CONCERN ABOUT WHAT LOOKED LIKE
16	A RUSH TO JUDGMENT AT THAT TIME ON THE COMMISSION
17	FEELING IT WAS BECAUSE IT WAS ONE OF THOSE
18	ISSUES THAT HAD LAID OUT THAT IT NEEDED TO ADDRESS
19	PRIOR TO BEGINNING OF RESTRUCTURING, AND NOTHING
20	HAD PARTICULARLY HAPPENED. THERE SEEMED TO BE A
21	SENSE OF URGENCY THIS SUMMER TO REACH SOME
22	RESOLUTION, PLUS A COUPLE OF THE MAJOR PROVIDERS
23	WERE SAYING YOU, THE COMMISSION, HAVE TO DO
24 25	SOMETHING TO RESOLVE THIS. THE UTILITIES WERE SAYING WE HAVE \$20 BILLION WORTH OF THESE

1	CONTRACTS THAT STRETCH OUT TO THE YEAR 2025, 2025,
2	AND THIS WAS GOING TO CREATE A MAKE A PROBLEM
3	FOR US BEING COMPETITIVE IN THE MARKETPLACE.
4	THE COMMISSIONER NEEPER ABOUT A
5	MONTH AGO HELD A MEETING WITH THE UTILITIES, THE
6	COMMISSION STAFF, AND SOME OF THE LARGE OIL AND
7	GAS CO-GENERATORS AND ON WHAT RESOLUTION COULD
8	BE REACHED WITH THE PARTIES. AND THE RESULTS OF
9	THAT MEETING WERE THE PARTIES WERE SO FAR APART
10	THAT NO RESOLUTION SEEMED TO BE IMMEDIATELY
11	PRESSING AND THE COMMISSION SUPPOSEDLY, ALTHOUGH
I	
12	GUESS THEY WOULDN'T SAY THAT, HAS SORT OF PUSHED
13	THIS ISSUE TO THE BACK BURNER, WHICH STILL
LEAVES	
14	US WITH A QUESTION OF WHAT DO WE DO WITH THE 30
OR	
15	SO BIOMASS PLANTS, THE WASTE-TO-ENERGY PLANTS
AND	
16	A HALF A DOZEN GAS RECOVERY AND OTHER QF'S IN
THIS	
17	RENEWABLE GROUP WHO EITHER HAVE FALLEN OFF THE
18	INTERIM STANDARD FOR FIXED PRICE PERIOD INTO
SHORT	
19	RUN AVOIDED COST, WHICH HAS SORT OF BLOWN COST

OF	
20	REDUCING POWER OR SOON SOON TO REACH THAT
21	CLIFF.
22	THE ENERGY COMMISSION'S RENEWABLES
23	FUND PICKS UP SOME OF THAT DIFFERENTIAL, BUT
24 25	DOESN'T RESOLVE ALL OF THOSE PROBLEMS, BUT WHILE IT'S STILL UNDER CONTRACT, THEY CANNOT GO WITH

1	MARKET TO THEIR SERVICES TO THE ELECTRIC
2	SERVICE PROVIDERS WHO ARE OUT SIGNING UP RETAIL
3	CUSTOMERS SOMETIMES AT A PREMIUM TO BUY CERTAIN
4	TYPES OF POWER.
5	THE I GUESS ONE OTHER ISSUE I'D
6	LIKE TO TOUCH ON IS THE IN AB-1890, CAL-EPA WAS
7	ASKED TO LOOK AT SOME LONG-TERM STRATEGIES FOR A
8	SHIFT OF THE COST OF THE BIOMASS POWER INDUSTRY TO
9	THE ELECTRIC RATEPAYER OF THE OLD SYSTEM TO OTHER
10	CLASSES OF BENEFICIARIES. THAT REPORT WAS DONE
11	AND SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATURE IN THE SPRING AND
12	SORT OF NOTHING HAS HAPPENED. THE BIOMASS POWER
13	INDUSTRY RIGHT NOW, THERE WERE THREE BILLS THAT
14	WERE INTRODUCED, ALL OF WHICH DID NOT GET THROUGH
15	THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION.
16	ONE OF THEM, AB-1513, ACTUALLY DID
17	PASS THE ASSEMBLY, BUT DIED, WHICH SHOULD HAVE
18	BEEN IN THE SENATE, WITH CONCERNS OVER TAX THE
19	WHOLE ISSUE OF TAX CREDITS LAST YEAR. THE
20	INDUSTRY RIGHT NOW IS LOOKING AT SOME OPTIONS
21	OF EITHER PUSHING THOSE BILLS OR SOME OTHER
22	SOLUTIONS THAT MAY HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED IN THE
23	CAL-EPA REPORT ARE SOME THAT MAY NOT HAVE EVEN
24 25	BEEN THOUGHT OF OR DISCUSSED THERE AND MAY ASK OUR ASK THE BOARD FOR SOME SUPPORT ON ANY

```
1
       SOME LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY THAT WE MAY DEVELOP AT
 2
       SOME LATER POINT. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?
 3
                MEMBER RELIS: SOUNDS PRETTY INDEFINITE.
 4
       I DON'T KNOW.
 5
                MS. GILDART: I THINK WE'RE GOING TO SEE
       SOME ACTION AFTER JANUARY 1ST. AS NEAL DESCRIBED,
 6
       THERE'S A SERIES OF THINGS THAT HAVE TO COME
7
       TOGETHER. THE ELECTRIC SERVICE PROVIDERS ARE
 8
       BUYING UP SOME CONTRACTS SO THAT THEY CAN, AND
 9
       THEY'LL BE IN OPERATION JANUARY 1ST, BUT YOU'VE
10
       GOT A WHOLE VARIETY OF DATES ON EXISTING CONTRACTS
11
       THAT MAY INTERFERE WITH THAT, AND THEN THERE'S THE
12
13
       MONIES PROVIDED BY THE ENERGY COMMISSION THAT HAVE
       BEEN FEEDING INTO SOME OF THE RENEWABLES. SO NO
14
       ONE'S QUITE SURE WHO'S GOING TO BE RECEIVING WHAT
15
16
       KIND OF FUNDING IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
                MEMBER RELIS: ALSO YOU PASSED OUT THIS
17
18
       BROCHURE, AND IT SPEAKS TO A COMPANY THAT WOULD BE
       MARKETING SOME BIOMASS ENERGY, AND I ASSUME ONE OF
19
       THE FACTORS WILL BE HOW MANY PEOPLE END UP
20
       SUBSCRIBING TO A FUEL MIX THAT WOULD INCLUDE
21
22
       BIOMASS. THAT'S AN IMPONDERABLE AT THIS POINT, I
23
       GUESS.
24
                MR. JOHNSON:
                              I THINK -- AS I SAID, THERE
25
       WERE OVER 200 PROVIDERS HAVE SIGNED UP AND CAN
```

- 1 MARKET THEIR SERVICES, BUT THERE'S ONLY, WHAT, 20
- 2 OR SO THAT ARE REALLY RIGHT NOW ACTIVELY OUT
- 3 THERE. A LOT OF THEM ARE SORT OF LOOKING AT HOW
- 4 WELL SOME OF THE OTHERS DO AND, YOU KNOW --
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: DAN, THIS IS YOUR CHANCE.
- 6 I KNOW YOU LOVE WINDMILLS SO MUCH, SO THERE'S MORE
- 7 WINDMILLS FOR YOU. YOU MIGHT WANT TO SUBSCRIBE.
- 8 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES. I'M SURE
- 9 THAT -- I'M SURE THAT I WOULD BE MORE THAN HAPPY.
- 10 I NOTICE THE FRONT -- INSIDE THE FRONT COVER HERE
- 11 ARE ALL THESE WINDMILLS.
- 12 CHAIRMAN JONES: WHAT THEY DON'T MARKET
- 13 THERE IS LANDFILL GENERATED GAS.
- 14 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THE REAL ENERGY.

CHAIRMAN JONES: ALL RIGHT. ANY OTHER

QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? THANK YOU, NEAL. THANK

YOU, MARTHA.

OPEN DISCUSSION? NOBODY. GEEZ.

THIS MEETING IS ADJOURNED. THANK YOU.

(THE HEARING CONCLUDED AT 11:05

A.M.)

